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CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney’s Office.
(GOBERNADOR) 省長

**Governor**

- **TOM BRADLEY, Democratic**
  Mayor, City of Los Angeles
  Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles
  洛杉磯市市長
  2

- **MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom**
  Educator
  Educadora 培養家
  4

- **GARY V. MILLER, American Independent**
  Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
  Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC
  社區大學校董
  6

- **JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian**
  Professor of Economics
  Profesor de Economía 經濟學教授
  8

- **GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN, Republican**
  Governor, State of California
  Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長
  10

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長

**Lieutenant Governor**

- **JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN, American Independent**
  Truck Driver
  Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機
  16

- **LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic**
  Lieutenant Governor
  Vicegobernador 副州長
  18

- **MIKE CURB, Republican**
  20

- **CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom**
  College Instructor
  Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師
  22

- **NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian**
  Author
  Autora 作家
  24

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajadora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Election Law Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor de Leyes Electorales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impresora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace / Political Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizador Político / Pacifista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Electrical Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Eléctrico Retirado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administradora de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Treasurer (Tesorero) 司庫

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom
Union/Community Organizer
Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California

RAY CULLEN, Libertarian
Certified Public Accountant
Contador Público Certificado

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent
Aviator
(Write-In) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法總長
Attorney General

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian
Attorney, Private Practice
Abogado, Despacho Propio

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom
Lawyer
Abogado

BRUCE GLEASON, Republican
Attorney-at-Law
Abogado

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic
Attorney General, California
Procurador General, California

GARY R. ODOM, American Independent
Attorney
Abogado
(Write-In) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGAUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic
Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican
Business Executive/Controller
Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom
Medical Relief Coordinator
Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos
(Write-In) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)</th>
<th>United States Senator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRECK McKinley, Libertarian</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor Financiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN, American Independent</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director del Comité Patriótico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU, Republican</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresista Estadounidense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS)</th>
<th>United States Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputada en el Congreso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico en Electrónica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA, Republican</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE “TED” ZUUR, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州參議員

- **RUSSELL GRAY, Republican**
  - Independent Businessman
  - Hombre de Negocios Independiente
- **QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent**
  - County Supervisor
  - Supervisor del Condado
- **LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic**
  - Member of the Legislature
  - Miembro de la Legislatura

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Member of the State Assembly (MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

- **MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom**
  - Child Care Teacher
  - Maestra de Guardería Infantil
- **MAX WOODS, Republican**
  - Cable Car Grampa
  - Fijador de Tranvías con Cables
- **ART AGNOS, Democratic**
  - State Assemblyman
  - Asambleísta Estatal

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Judicial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall <strong>ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall <strong>JOSEPH GRODIN</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall <strong>STANLEY MOSK</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justices</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm M. Lucas</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz Reynoso</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward A. Panelli</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Newsom</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Holmdahl</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anthony Kline</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E. Benson</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Martin &quot;Al&quot; Rouse</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>Shall JAMES B. SCOTT be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNELL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall M. O. SABRAW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall HARRY W. LOW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>Shall ZERNE P. HANING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>Shall DONALD B. KING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 離職女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebramos la Vida 時代黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología 犯罪學學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctor en Leyes/Comerciante 律師博士/女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 學理地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Services Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Dir. de Servicios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para Jovenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Educator/Padre/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA, CPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM#153 Educational Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, SF School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/President, Conseyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Educación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUIE</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Presidente de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporación de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computadoras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Maestro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/Maestro/Ingeniero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator/Educadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner, SF School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Administrator/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner, Conseyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Educación; Administrador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Community College Board</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORRAN</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, SF Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Member, Junta del Colegio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la Comunidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado/Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There is no contest for District Director in this district)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Act of 1996. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>YES 235, NO 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1996. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>YES 238, NO 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Act of 1996. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>YES 241, NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>YES 244, NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>YES 247, NO 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation, Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1988-89, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>YES 250, NO 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>YES 252, NO 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation, Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>YES 255, NO 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>YES 259, NO 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>PROPOSICIÓN</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES**

**LEY DE ERIONDE BORGES-HUGHES DE 1898 PARA LA COMPRA-APRENDEDIZJO DE ESCUELAS ESPECIALIZADAS.** Esta ley permite la compra de becas con valor del estudiante mínimo de alumnas (200,000,000) para que las familias puedan pagar la escuela completa y mayor de las becas plebeya en cantidad de 120,000,000 de alumnas (200,000,000). Validación de la compra de becas para las escuelas de educación superior.

**LEY DE ERIONDE BORGES DE 1898 PARA LA CONSTRUCIóN DE MAUVAS PIONERAS.** Esta ley permite la adquisición de terrenos con valor de alumnas mínimo de alumnas (200,000,000) para que las escuelas de educación superior puedan funcionar.

**LEY DE ERIONDE BORGES DE 1898 PARA FINANCIAR NUEVOS EN LA UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE**. Esta ley permite la adquisición de terrenos con valor de 300,000,000 de alumnas (300,000,000) para que las escuelas de educación superior puedan funcionar.

**BENEFICIO DE JUBILACIÓN PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES.** Proporciona los beneficios de jubilación de las personas que han contribuido a la constitución del Estado.

**IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES.** Estos impuestos se basan en los ingresos de las familias y se destinan a la educación pública.

**CALCULO DEL INICIAL.** Proporciona una fórmula para calcular el inicial de un proyecto.

**LEY DE ERIONDE BORGES DE 1898 PARA FINANCIAR NUEVOS EN LA UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE**. Esta ley permite la adquisición de terrenos con valor de 300,000,000 de alumnas (300,000,000) para que las escuelas de educación superior puedan funcionar.

**ELECCIÓN DEL FISCAL GENERAL.** Proporciona los requisitos para el cargo del Fiscal General y del Fiscal General de la República.

**IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIA.** Proporciona los requisitos para el cambio de residencia.

**DEPENDENCIA DE TRABAJO Y DEPENDENCIA DE RELACIONES LABORALES.** Proporciona los requisitos para la dependencia de trabajo y relaciones laborales.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Local Taxation. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>YES 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Official State Language. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Toxic Discharge and Exposure Restrictions. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>YES 269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
<td>YES 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td>YES 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td>YES 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>287</th>
<th>288</th>
<th>290</th>
<th>291</th>
<th>293</th>
<th>294</th>
<th>296</th>
<th>297</th>
<th>299</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>302</th>
<th>303</th>
<th>305</th>
<th>306</th>
<th>308</th>
<th>309</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES**

1. **Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?**
2. **Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?**
3. **Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?**
4. **Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?**
5. **Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?**
6. **Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?**
7. **Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, entender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?**
8. **Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?**

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

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

第一步
请双手持票向自動機時整張選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接
合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把打針之選票針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白
袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
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WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facilities (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters." A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it doesn’t matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- Mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinaro’s plans for preserving small neighborhood businesses and property interests. I want to represent the people, especially the people in the city in the future.

VOTER SELECTION CARD (continued)

Supervisor

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269 270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Education

Comm. College Board

BART Board (If any)

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.


RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:


YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it doesn’t matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of other political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for a candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Board. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)

A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:


WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinarri's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:


RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Consultant
Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.
Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SF State Public Research Institute.
With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.
I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Statements are voluntarily by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
RICHARD D. HONGOIST

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I’d like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections. A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keys standing at the door. Let me in to supe’ with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

The sponsors for Andrew “Daddy” Jones are:
Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
— I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON
My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton
The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY
My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley
The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue. My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District. My age is 36. My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984. I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street. My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors. My age is 46. My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage child care, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court. My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors. My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:


The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
Defend workers' rights against employers.
No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________ Apt. # ______

Address __________________________ Telephone No. (required) __________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ________________

Second choice locations (if any) ________________

Signature ____________________________

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

27
ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMAC and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Paul Wotman

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Hotel Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School’s employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in competitive job market.

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)
My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.
Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

GREG DAY
My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor’s Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco’s Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor’s Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board.

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:
WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street

My occupation is Teacher/Engineer

My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Uloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so — Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:


MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue

My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education

My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:


GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue

My occupation is Computer Corporation President

My age is 26

My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molino Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue. With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, YES 273
1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 NO 274
for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residen-
tial areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption $46,200,000
Bond Interest 38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes — (and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter’s Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

— Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

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

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miranda Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litcheiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Wille E. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Ensminger, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halsenh, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumper will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residen-

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jesse T. Esteva
Delph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.
Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.
When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.
Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Myra A. Kopy, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbates, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Deniseim, Member, Board of Education
Joanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sondra M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anays, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.
Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.
Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.
Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.
Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas P. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Levy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoohio Nakashima

Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pammy Paxton-Miller
Bruce W. Lillehalth
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Branner
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinoso, BART Board candidate
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corwin, President, California Steam Company

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco’s preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

• Yes on Proposition A.
• Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART-Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

J. M. Euneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter’s Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

Dean McGrig, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Sted, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Herlager, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000? YES 276  NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Redemption</th>
<th>$140,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>145,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$285,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths (0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone...
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventiongoers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventiongoers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventiongoers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventiongoers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and all San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $150,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie R. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

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

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

VOTE on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues, and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The underground of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Bath and Jim Gravatt
Tony Kline
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.
Doug Engman
Sue Berman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Ranzick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONEN CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279

NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down. The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called “refunding.” It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don’t last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A “Yes” vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A “Yes” vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings,

fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?  

YES 282  NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

• It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.

• It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.

• It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs— keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbedue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy. Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs. Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Kruskow
Wilbur Jiggies
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frunk
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

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

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbano, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denehein
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Denise M. Collins
Patricia Arco
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafal, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Harrado
Commissioner Carlos T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mouron
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments. Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Mollinari
Louise K. Mollinari
William Cobleite
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Solomon
E. Porcher Hester

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

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition I, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Mollinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bidg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer’s & Shophands Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne

Harry G. Brit
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Intl. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Timney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Clayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Stella Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Mohr
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Paulkner

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

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul E. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Melinnari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F
Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?  

YES 287  NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Salia Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Million Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon  Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00  Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10  Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30  Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35  Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50  Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55  Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00  Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05  Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20  Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30  Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35  Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50  Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? YES 290  NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donnay Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 8, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable. Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilenithal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carla Tasidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Jose San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Peis, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margot Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses.

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better-government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads...“notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

What is a Minority?

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker  Harry Britt
Bill Maher  Carol Ruth Silver
Willie B. Kennedy  Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Gino, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. Mcclain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenheim, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you — our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: "Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)
Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person’s taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco’s art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Numerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Pia, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurateur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodrigue, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Philip Agee, Artist
Pam Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresa Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggren Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Ears-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kubo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marton, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nalp, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spalding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Controller's Statement on “M”

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

“Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space;

2. Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) “Preexisting office space” shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not necessary to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(l) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT

ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaña!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park — there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983 — during the last anti-highrise campaigns — the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 exist-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Stil, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Eyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Ena Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods — higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity. PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men — 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people going lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women — but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Eyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Ena Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

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

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives — higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

• tens of thousands of jobs;
• lower housing costs;
• smaller tax burden;

• better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
• a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city — I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Moriles
Celu Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Nee Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parksde Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That’s also why they are lying to you.

They don’t want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn’t.

They don’t want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don’t want you to know that YOUR priorities aren’t THEIR priorities. And that it’s not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orange Island site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Allan Chin
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wong
Chanelle Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Bridege
Robert De Wit
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kutsnik
Milo Nodler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schechtman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whitaker, Stonestown Tenants Association

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

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh

Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Paulsen
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza

Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Boston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliott
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

Absent Voter Ballot Application
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Cheryl Burd

Voting Rights and Political Participation Committee (SFV)

200 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Fighting for Quality in Your Neighborhood

District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Fremont Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

San Francisco Tenants Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sunset-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunset Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Sectors of San Francisco's

As Board Chairman of the

Ends Technicians Local 15

Phyllis Lyon
Jack Morrison
Dale Carlson
David Looman

1984-85, the needs of resident San Francisco's interests and out-of-town
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Basson
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravani
Kayren Huddiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing congestion; severe strains on living prices; loss of open space unpleasant and unhealthy places.

The Downtown Plan had answer. Neighborhood plannings seek the growth and orderly development of space per year. Development of up to approximate space. The Current City Land use and privileges to a few developers political processes and the Franciscans.

Massive political contributions have created loopholes, exempted and encourage commen.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Place Postage Here
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Coyote Valley Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunsetside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Ahrens
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darrell Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Ames
Dean Anderson
Karen Apuna & Peter Parsley
Buck Bogot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwater
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenaive
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Coperithi
Zack Cowan
Susan Crillican
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Davekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davis
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebein
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ellis Driscoll
Alvin Dukin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Robero Estes
Becky Evans
Don Feasar
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betsy Garrey
Gustavia Gish
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Hersog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoor
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jacobs
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kiley
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Kugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Korwin
Steven Krofft
Henry Knoll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphsyme MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehrgan
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Mohnare
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mossic
Dennis Moske
Jane McCaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O’Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacuruar
Dick Pabich
Elisabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender

George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Bivaldo
John Riedan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwarz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain

Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schuch
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Ari Halp Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strauss
Howard Straussner
Linda Stump
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Lourie Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor

Paul Thurston
Ellen Tubby
Marie Urdig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brian Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Walker
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wexwich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wing
Rich Yuran

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the city in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keefe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It will also deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from lying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Hiskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilenthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naiveté is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY

James Haas
Michael Berneck
Mark Buell
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a citywide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.

2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of falling retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L. Johnston, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Printers' and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Esquerra, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Pete Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrisers. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

• Meeting transportation needs
• Expanding the stock of affordable housing.

• Developing park and open space areas.
• Meeting earthquake safety requirements
• Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M’s priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Franciscans to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.
First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities— rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.
Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.
In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.
The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.
Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion
Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.
Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services
Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.
I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Alzawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Vlad Donnally, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichstaedt, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Ray Scota, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Sperry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charnes E. Stafen, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.
Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation
Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood-renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.
Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M
Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Ruddon, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arturo V. Yopin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Rudin, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco’s public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Ria Alviar
H. Jesse Arnette, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Yoon-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Carron, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eckman, Administrator
Terry A. Francis, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel

Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Clarence Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplans, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Over Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Elmo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamashita, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hsinwashi Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of “neighborhood power” Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Ye, President, Benny Ye and Assoc.
Pias Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Frank Fang, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Love M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can’t improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we’ve got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired
PROPOSITION N
Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? YES 308 NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:
“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Melinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.
• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
“CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES” means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfills and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY, AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per cent per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealy
Deputy City Attorney
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the development of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods", identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs".

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs"; on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds from open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986. This section does not give any member a benefit prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.

97
NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for the transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member’s retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member’s effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.
8.407 Compensation adjustments.
The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldfaced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.
8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments
(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensation are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(i) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(ii) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(iii) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(iv) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earmark" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the rates of pay paid to members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay shall be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the department in gaining added compensation as set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department of the highest compensation shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-
age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-
ars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earmark" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or horsemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

c. Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropria
tion ordinance and the annual salary ordi
nance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Nothing in the any of the charter provi
sion, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually fur
ther increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 popu
lation or over in the State of California as de
fined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and an
nual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation af
ter the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agree
ment, further to fix the rates of compensation

for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the an
nual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for pay
ning the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall deter
mine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Con
sumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities in
cluded in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is de
fined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publica
tion. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statis
tics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods thereto used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such in
creases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living in
crease of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representa
tives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions con
tained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pur
suant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supercede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions con
tained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensa
tion is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the ap
plication of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibi
tion against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supercede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications pre
scribed by section 8.100 of this charter may sub
mit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service com
mission. Provided, however, applicants for pos
itions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; exami
nation or appointment must become residents within the meaning of Section 8:100 within a re
asonable time, not to exceed six months, after com
pletion of the probationary period provided in Section 8:340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 52 years of age at the time of appoint
ment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uni
formed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereo
f to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such ex
amination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fire
man from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has suc
cessfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2-Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 16, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2-Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559, may retire for service at his or her 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 meet
ing the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retir

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

8.520 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications pre
scribed by section 8.100 of this charter may sub
mit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service com
mission. Provided, however, applicants for pos
itions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; exami
nation or appointment must become residents within the meaning of Section 8:100 within a re
asonable time, not to exceed six months, after com
pletion of the probationary period provided in Section 8:340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 52 years of age at the time of appoint
ment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uni
formed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereo
f to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such ex
amination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fire
man from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has suc
cessfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2-Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 16, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2-Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559, may retire for service at his or her 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 meet
ing the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retir

moment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife or 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, the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.558-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, or completes twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty-five years, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her 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. 8.558-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assistants.
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligibles lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

fitification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(7) (9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to, all the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent appointees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and who shall not lose these civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department’s certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,600 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department’s list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:
SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:
SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become even more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate such adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City’s residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil-drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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Application for Absentee Ballot is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write “Please send me an absentee ballot,” tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.
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POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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## CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.
**GOBERNADOR**  州長  
**Lieutenant Governor** 副州長

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Educator Educatora 教育家</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist. Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics Professor de Economia 經濟學教授</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Governor, State of California Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Truck Driver Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor 負責州長</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>College Instructor Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Author  Autora 作家</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

*Vote por Uno Vote for One*
### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aviador</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>President of the Board of Equalization</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRECK MCKINLEY</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. &quot;ED&quot; VALLEN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
( THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT )
( No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal )

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly
Vote por Uno

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom 115 →
Child Care Teacher
Maestra de Guardería Infantil 母亲保育

MAX WOODS, Republican 117 →
Cable Car Gripman
Pijador de Tranvías con Cables 橫車司機

ART AGNOS, Democratic 119 →
State Assemblyman
Asambleísta Estatal 州衆議員

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 121 →

GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 1986
JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? YES 123 → NO 124 →

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
Shall JOSEPH GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? YES 126 → NO 127 →

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? YES 129 → NO 130 →
<p>| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 132 | NO 133 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 135 | NO 136 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall EDWARD A. PANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 138 | NO 139 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE | Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 141 | NO 142 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE | Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 144 | NO 145 |
| FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 147 | NO 148 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 150 | NO 151 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 153 | NO 154 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>ROBERT W. MERRILL</td>
<td>YES 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>JAMES B. SCOTT</td>
<td>YES 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>CARL WEST ANDERSON</td>
<td>YES 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>WILLIAM R. CHANNEIL</td>
<td>YES 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>M. O. SABRAW</td>
<td>YES 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>HARRY W. LOW</td>
<td>YES 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>ZERNE P. HANING</td>
<td>YES 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>DONALD B. KING</td>
<td>YES 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo, 現任市參議員</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores, 現任市參議員</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente, 單立女商人</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida, 生活黨</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONIGSTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores, 市參議員</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología, 犯罪學學生</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning, 超級地毯清潔公司老闆</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALOITO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante, 法學博士／女商人</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista, 社會主義行動</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores, 市參議員</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo, 現任市參議員</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSO</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal, 助理地方檢察官</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR.**
### Member, Board of Education
**Vote for No More than Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND VEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educador/Padre/Educador</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA/商務管理碩士、註冊公共會計師</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPP</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/President de Corporación de Computadoras</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUIE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Mestro/Ingeniero</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora 教育家</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradore de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board
**Vote for No More than Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/Membro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)**

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $57 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA HACER MÁS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>LEY DE ERUGIÓN DE AGUAS GREEN-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE EXPROPIADO PARA U. E.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECCIÓN DEL FISCAL PÚBLICO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>ELECCIÓN DEL FISCAL PÚBLICO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRIBUCION DE HABITANTES Y EMPLEADOS PÚBLICOS CONTRIBUÍDOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>CONTRIBUCION DE HABITANTES Y EMPLEADOS PÚBLICOS CONTRIBUÍDOS</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officials and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENERAL ELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after-school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Votación</td>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Proposición Eclesiástica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>262 NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos a los que se sometan los gobiernos locales y distritos, se han de someter a los tres tercios partes del voto. Para que sean efectivos, se requiere de un voto mayoritario de dos tercios del total de votantes. Para que sean efectivos, se requiere de un voto mayoritario de dos tercios del total de votantes.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÍNDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNITARIA (AIDS). Declara que el paro de la enfermedad se debe a la falta de vacunas o a la falta de tratamiento adecuado. Para que sean efectivos, se requiere de un voto mayoritario de dos tercios del total de votantes.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67 NO</td>
<td>68 SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PREVENCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. 1986. Para emitir bonos con un valor total de $40,000,000 para mejorar el sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco.</td>
<td>70 NO</td>
<td>71 SI</td>
<td>72 SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agenda de Redestralización (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?</td>
<td>74 NO</td>
<td>75 SI</td>
<td>76 SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingreso del voto para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>78 NO</td>
<td>79 SI</td>
<td>80 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá usar la ciudad por menos de 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por menos de el 44% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedad baldía o espacios abiertos?</td>
<td>82 SI</td>
<td>83 NO</td>
<td>84 SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desde entonces en una cantidad proporcional?</td>
<td>86 NO</td>
<td>87 SI</td>
<td>88 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of &quot;reciprocal retirement benefits&quot; for their workers under state law?</td>
<td><strong>YES 287</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 288</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td><strong>YES 290</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 291</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td><strong>YES 293</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 294</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td><strong>YES 296</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 297</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td><strong>YES 299</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td><strong>YES 302</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 303</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Proposition L was removed from the ballot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td><strong>YES 305</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 306</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td><strong>YES 308</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 309</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF BALLOT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausentan de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para otorgar aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por mineras y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Deberá extender la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>¿Deberá Imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Deberá Imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

A 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

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

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

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，應合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把帶錨之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入信封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it doesn’t matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your home address,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—you should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
Candidates for Supervisor

**ANGELA ALIOTO**

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue  
My occupation is Doctor of Law/  
Businesswoman  
My age is 35  
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly

**WILLIAM BROWN, JR.**

My address is 2310 Powell Street  
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for  
ideal business and experience with property interests of the residential districts to represent the possible city in the  

**RAYMOND COATS**

My address is 419 Garfield Street  
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner  
My age is 37  
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.  
I attended Jedia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson.  
My father organized the Oceanview, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore Oceanview Playground. I am deeply interested, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:


---

**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

(continued)

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>City Propos</th>
<th>State Propos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235 236</td>
<td>273 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238 239</td>
<td>276 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241 242</td>
<td>279 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244 245</td>
<td>282 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247 248</td>
<td>285 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250 251</td>
<td>287 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252 253</td>
<td>290 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255 256</td>
<td>293 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259 260</td>
<td>296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261 262</td>
<td>299 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263 264</td>
<td>302 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266 267</td>
<td>305 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269 270</td>
<td>308 309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**

---

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by
October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a
form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what party you consider
yours you can check the box on the
saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it d
matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of
another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote fi
candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a pr
election, you can only choose among the candidates of
pary. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this elect
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State,
troller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Boa
Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember,
Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and
bers of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Bi
Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of a
will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is
there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t
help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling
place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if
I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and
will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know
how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will
have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>129  124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>126  127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>129  130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>132  133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>135  136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>138  139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>141  142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>144  145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>147  148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your
choices on this card and bring it with
you into the voting booth. It will make
easier for you and will reduce the
time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of
Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of
Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee
election gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day,
November 4, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO
My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.
My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is, and my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS
My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.
I attended Jedia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chair/Board of Directors and Initiated Programs
For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

THE SPONSORS FOR ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS ARE:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson
Susan Brady Alfaro, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer
David D. Arduin, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Contractor
Robert B. Baccal, 3172 23rd Ave., Attorney
Luis A. Belmar, 285 Walnut St., Developer
Jack Casdell, 118 Leon Avenue St., Civil Advocate
Frances A. Condon, 5206 2nd Ave., Housewife
Kathleen Cormier, 321 Richland Ave., Writer
Lee S. Dafson, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St., Professor
Belle Finkle, 1000 Green St., Investor
Reub Haukamp, 1595 Noe St., Computer Consultant
Robert L. Hogan, 397 Clay St., Consultant
Natalie J. Houston, 22 Delgado St., Consultant
Henrietta O'dell Humphries, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor
Walter G. Jebe, 34 Polarity Wy., Businessman
Gordon J. Loo, 549 19th Ave., Attorney
Richard N. Lerman, 67 Wawona St., Consultant
Leroy Looper, 827 Guerrero St., Director
Richard William Lowry, 2345 47th Ave., Consultant
John J. Noonan, 1075 Polson St., Photo-Engineer
Linda M. Radigan, 1864 12th Ave., PR/Communications
William J. Rappaport, 2190 Green St., Developer
Linda M. Robertson, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer
Nancy Scheinb, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect
Daniel Schultz, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Physician
Helen Hill Smith, 66 Fernando Wy, Teacher
Magie Sonier, 4388 17th St., Social Worker
Donald N. Strauss, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped on Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

THE SPONSORS FOR DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO ARE:

Richard Alvarez, 350 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker
Linda Bartholomew, 3500 Huyman Ave., Waitress
Carroll Arthur Bjorksted, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist
Concepcion B. Castilla, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aide
Virginia Carroll, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson
Victoria Castillo, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator
Julietta C. DeSantis, 1209 Silver Ave., Staff Associate
John M. Gonzalez, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Mechanic
John Green, 773 Lisbon St., Retired
Robert Karp, 530 Brussels St., Deacon
Michael Mathis, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver
Charlton David McKay, 161 11th Ave., Doorman
Ramona Michaels, 331 Bonita St., Secretary
James Muscat, Jr., 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk
Barbara Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader
Vernon M. Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter
Delores Robles, 217 Felton St., Homemaker
Ernest R. Robles, 217 Felton St., Steward
William H. Ruth, 522 Shotwell St., Mason
Darryl Franklin Sanchez, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary
Clarence Cornish Smith, 640 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver
Robert Valarde, 492 Amberst St., Police Officer
Terrance C. Vieras, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper
Helen C. Walker, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly
Panchita Rae Weight, 880 Gearying St., Homemaker
Judy J. Xuereb, 521 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF. Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keys standing at the door. Let me in to supre' with you and you with I, that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER
My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS
My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militaryization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxins. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

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

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
—I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
—I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
—Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:
mulder, 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunterred by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.
As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.
Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public".

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________
Address__________________________Apt. #________
Telephone No. (required)__________

Do you have an automobile? yes ___ no ___

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s):______________
Second choice locations (if any)___________________________

Signature________________________

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

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is — City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students. I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed — on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committee, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committee man Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor: "Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian." "City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discriminated BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President.
Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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MYOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Asparas Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:
Candiates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.
Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Julie C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
William Felzer

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders. 
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Myra G. Kopf

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board. Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Gilman Louie

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:
MICHAEL MOBERG
My address is 222 Molino Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.
My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

LELAND YEE, PH.D.
My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, YES 273
1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 NO 274
for the improvement of the fire protection system
within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and
fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had pro-
gress to improve its fire protection system. A bond
issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements,
including an extension of the high pressure firefight-
ing water system which operates independently from
the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are
still parts of the City which are not served by that high
pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the
City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obliga-
tion bonds. This money would pay for improvements
in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These
improvements would include extending the high pres-
sure system, construction of new cisterns in residen-
tial areas, installation of a high pressure pump station
at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency opera-
tions center, and other projects. The interest and prin-
cipal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax
revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in
the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San
Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling
$46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the
City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want
San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements
in the City’s fire protection system.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and
when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20)
year basis and after consideration of the interest rates
related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion,
it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$46,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$38,808,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$85,008,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption
schedules, the average annual debt requirement for
twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which
amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty
hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in
favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August
6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION A
APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE
MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING
LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter’s Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

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

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Ensmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0220 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litchiner, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Neider, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarino, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney
Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSAL A.

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbato, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebaim, Member, Board of Education
Johanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSAL A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire... the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A... fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Rosanne Mankin
Jane McCausle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSAL A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Berman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brumm
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan

Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Ruberman
Ralph Huruda
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks

Carole Migen
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas P. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Brew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Paterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to a lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.
Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes:
- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

J. M. Enemelen, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foo, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catas-
trophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.
—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Sup-
plies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagra-
tion (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Ponsillo, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Sup-
plies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Berrue, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegan, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?  

YES 276  NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Redemption</th>
<th>$140,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$145,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$285,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Francisco's reputation as “Everybody's Favorite City” each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning — solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously — one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually — a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually — a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't agree unanimously — but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone...
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $500,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Franciscotaxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louie Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future.
Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.
Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of
approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and
$3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.
If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will
enact a modest increase in the hotel tax — a tax paid only by visitors
to San Francisco — which will more than pay for the expansion of
Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San
Francisco residents.
Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax
base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.
Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a posi-
tive statement on behalf of the city's economy.
The convention element of the visitor industry represents more
than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create
thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for
the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.
Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we
will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of
jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this
convention business.
The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and
meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of
current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have
grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and
exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will
not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such
as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their con-
vention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain
our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention
Center.
The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed
by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.
The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena
Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The un-
dergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt
any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center de-
sign concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate
traffic movement in the area.
We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's conven-
tion industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large
hotels and restaurants.
Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the
thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists,
the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and
graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers,
boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public
relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—
located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.
The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to
thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's
why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving — well into
the next century.
Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it
here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and gener-
ate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.
As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking
proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner                          Stanley Bramwell
Lisa Klobucar                            Tom Spinosar
Robert Silvestri
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergirding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.
Vote NO.
Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONENCE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 →
NO 280 →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding." It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage at interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the

City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Fonan Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won’t cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPONETION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco’s open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco’s children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:
- It doesn’t cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It’s time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter’s Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

• Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Dugan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Kruskow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

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

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kogel, President
A. Richard Cerbator, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
Joanne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sedonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlos T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguiar Bard
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinar
Louise K. Molinar
William Coblenz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salamon
E. Porcher Hester
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City. Join us in voting YES on D!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City’s expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”
Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Dening, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.

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

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans. Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon  Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00  Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10  Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30  Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35  Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50  Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55  Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00  Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05  Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20  Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30  Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35  Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50  Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:
It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Fluray
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwayne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey? YES 293  NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
BEGINNS ON PAGE 98
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year longstanding pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Marin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outdated attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by nonminority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Brint, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
Joanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agnes Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mesey
Carol Mesey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by non-minority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbata, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years. The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horancy  Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison  Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Trexler del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margie Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments.

It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads..."notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...".

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H!

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Police & Fire Pay

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296  NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities — yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California’s 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker Harry Britt
Bill Maher Carol Ruth Silver
Willie B. Kennedy Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Prev.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraud, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Prev.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenheim, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Speaker of the Assembly
HONORABLE ART AGNOS, Member of the Assembly
HONORABLE JOHN FORAN, Member of the Senate
SALA BURTON, Member of Congress
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299

NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation’s capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

The Promise Fulfilled

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her granddaughter to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: “This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen.” I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this “off” presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those whose choice not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

“Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!”

(EDITOR’S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar’s City Hall office.)
Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?  YES 302  NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Kee, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McEllroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masahasi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nelson, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephan Pen Kazwa, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velich Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN
Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.
(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.
(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:
1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;
2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;
3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;
4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;
5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;
6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;
8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.
(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.
(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.
(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the project of the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT
Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(i) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.
(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(i) is amended as follows:
Subsection 320(g)(i) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:
(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(1)(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.
(a) Limit.
1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows:

4. Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.
(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of buildings, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.
(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all city office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all city office development projects approved after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Francisco are clear: overcrowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grosboll   Jim Morales
Dennis Atenore   Jack Morrison
Jim Handler   Pat Norman
Sue Foster   Alan Roznick
Geraldine Johnson   Calvin Welch
Michael Lighty   Susan Weisberg
Esther Marks   Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called “controls” in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don’t be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Beker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behenna
August Cappola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Puciar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Remle
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sommerberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thellen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are completed, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clinton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Lloyd
Yvonne Scarlet-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson

Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betsy Miosia, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundromat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrisers.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

• tens of thousands of jobs;
• lower housing costs;
• smaller tax burden;

• better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
• a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco— for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city —

I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royde
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
—made downtown into a series of dark, wind-swept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighborhoods
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That’s why City Hall is so afraid of it. That’s also why they are lying to you.

They don’t want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn’t.

They don’t want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent — despite state law that requires consistency.

They don’t want you to know that YOUR priorities aren’t THEIR priorities. And that it’s not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan — THEIR priority — gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it’s important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City’s zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned “Heavy Industrial.”

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don’t listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown — that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim

Gilman Louie
Lorraine Love
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overddevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigade
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Guterman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jedli Reid
Steve Schechtman
Robert Shepard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

"Affordable Housing Alliance
"Council of Community Housing Organizations
"San Francisco Tenants’ Union
“Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

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

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood. Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Bostom
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Eich
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudibburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Stoed
Lester Zedman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too. Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City’s ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City’s job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baust
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Motegijean
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

: sectors of San Francisco's
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1. Pegills Lyon
2. Jack Morrison
3. Dale Carlson
4. David Looman

san francisco community party
san francisco league of environmental voters (sflv)
san francisco tenants' union
san francisco tomorrow (sft)
sierra club, san francisco chapter
sunrise-sunset neighborhood association
sunset heights association of responsible people (share)
sunset-parkside education action committee (speak)
sunrise neighborhood association
telegraph hill dwellers
tenderloin housing clinic
twin peaks council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space, and services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Bascon
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravina
Kayren Huddihugh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Snead
Leslie Zeldman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of growth the last decade has had a direct impact on the area's environment — causing traffic congestion; severe strains on housing prices; loss of open space and pleasant and unhealthy pollution.

The Downtown Plan had an answer. Neighborhood plan.

REPUBLICAN:

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican Central Committee, we decide on the orderly growth and orderly development.

Proposition M is a responsible decision of up to approximately one space per year. Development

Current City Land use and political processes have created loopholes and have created loopholes, exemptions, and City permits which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Boston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lonnin
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Morgosian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.
Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sunyana-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

• Better public transit.
• Preserving and building affordable housing.
• Protecting a diverse economic base.
• Preserving neighborhood businesses.
• Preserving landmarks.
• Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abravanel
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardti
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidsala
Angela Alito
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Ames
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Bauerngarten

Linda Chapman
Susan Chalome
Marjorie Childs
Marie Clesbey
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crofut
Ann Crow
Denise D'Immo
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Denmark
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Deneheim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Elia Driscoll
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feuer
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gann
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Bety Garvey
Gustavio Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Hour
Don Hodapp
Jan and Max Holloway
John Holzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaacks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elyne Jones
Bill and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Kugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ina Kraft
S.S. Kashi
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layda
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Pauline and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Viviam Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Missak
Tim Molina
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McCaskie Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
Jane Osterberg
Rick Pachar
Dick Pachich
Elizabeth Page
Grace MacDuff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Saundra Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Remselaer
Jim Rivero
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rampf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorra
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Striton
Janet Storm
Joan Strauss
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swartz
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabucy
Marie Uitzig
David Vele
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Walker
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wetrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Wynn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
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run down storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent than is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Proposition M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M would drastically affect every part of the City’s economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

San Francisco’s neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M’s priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the “existing neighborhood character.”

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Garwood, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco’s economy.

Our City’s small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the city. Did you know:

• Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
• Proposition M’s priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
• Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don’t let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public’s uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and “take San Francisco back from the developers”. If their sincerity is beyond question, the naiveté is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco’s future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas
Michael Bernick
Mark Buell
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life.
Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:
1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a citywide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.
2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedence over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.
The City needs both well-planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minority communities! Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.
Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?
Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.
San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.
Vote No on Proposition M.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.
The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.
Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.
Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!
It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.
Vote No on Proposition M.
Leandra P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco Lina Escobar, Mission Neighborhood Task Force Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc. Eduardo Castillo, Accountant Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs
Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues
San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M
The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrisers. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!
City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.
The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:
- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.
The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.
This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.
We cannot afford Proposition M — Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M
Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called “conservationists”, the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco’s economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M’s priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City’s depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don’t let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It’s another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M’s extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City’s General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant’s Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce B. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnally, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayne, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jele, Owner, Jele Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scala, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charme S. Staken, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothchild, Broker, Rothchild Cappiello
Kenneth Sprout, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commins, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Tooplin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
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Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco’s public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Canco
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gilliam, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Horney
Constance C. Hutchinson
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemoverksi, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yasazaki, Jr., Attorney
Rodrick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joanne B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey
Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can’t improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we’ve got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired
Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?  

YES 308  NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”:

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N: “Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kong, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from seawater and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading and unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of...
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated: FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipale fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges, the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced; the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimated cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

With the voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If, and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purpose set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per cent per annum, payable semiannually.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park Renovation Fund
(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.
(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6400 (a)(o)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to prejudice any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.
(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or used only on the southern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.
(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used for the same purposes as they were originally set aside. The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).
(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund. At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs".
(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.
(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8539.4 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8597, 8599, 8584, 8586 and 8588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmission of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.
8.407 Compensation adjustments.
The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.
8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments
(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(I) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean “compensation earmarked” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The term of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol officer on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earmarked” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member’s service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months; after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340:

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States;

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States;

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitled them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information therein in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2-Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2; Fireman; and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from List E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of List E-25; Class H2; Fireman; even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment:

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement...
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-40, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife, 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her through his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-4 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent 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 wife, 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her through his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(i) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(ii) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that present-ey employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided here- in, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified satisfactory by the appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-
tification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(7) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employees of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrator of the department shall be the appointing officer as provided in this chapter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate, said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed by said utility for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoffs in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not been by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65985 as any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:
SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:
SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;
(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;
(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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Arguments ..................................................... 57, 58
Legal Text ..................................................... 97

PROPOSITION F
Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.
Analysis ...................................................... 59
Arguments ..................................................... 60, 61
Legal Text ..................................................... 61

PROPOSITION G
Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.
Analysis ...................................................... 62
Arguments ..................................................... 63
Legal Text ..................................................... 98

PROPOSITION H
Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.
Analysis ...................................................... 64
Arguments ..................................................... 65-68
Legal Text ..................................................... 98

PROPOSITION I
Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.
Analysis ...................................................... 69
Arguments ..................................................... 70-72
Legal Text ..................................................... 98

PROPOSITION J
Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.
Analysis ...................................................... 73
Arguments ..................................................... 74
Legal Text ..................................................... 100

PROPOSITION K
Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.
Analysis ...................................................... 75
Arguments ..................................................... 76
Legal Text ..................................................... 101

PROPOSITION L
Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M
Would enact more stringent development controls.
Analysis ...................................................... 77, 78
Arguments ..................................................... 79-93
Legal Text ..................................................... 78

PROPOSITION N
Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.
Analysis ...................................................... 94
Arguments ..................................................... 95
Legal Text ..................................................... 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom
Worker
Trabajadora

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales

THERESA "TEA" DIETRICH, American Independent
Printer
Impresora

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom
Peace/Pacific Organizer
Organizador Pacifista

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent
Retired Electrical Director
Director Retirado de Electricidad

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California

CAROLYN TREYNO, Libertarian
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

Controller

(ESTADO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Contador Público Certificado</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td>Aviador</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor Financiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN, American Independent |
| Director, Patriotic Committee |
| Director del Comité Patriótico |
| 83 → |

| ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic |
| United States Senator |
| Senador de Estados Unidos |
| 85 → |

| PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom |
| Socialist Organizer |
| Organizador Socialista |
| 87 → |

| ED ZSCHAU, Republican |
| U.S. Congressman |
| Congresista Estadounidense |
| 89 → |

(Write-In) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Representative</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputada en el Congreso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian |
| Electronics Technician |
| Técnico en Electrónica |
| 98 → |

| MIKE GARZA, Republican |
| 100 → |

| THEODORE “TED” ZUUR, Peace and Freedom |
| Worker |
| Trabajador |
| 102 → |

(Write-In) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

| 104 → |
**State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参议员**  
**Vote for One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY, Republican</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>Independiente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic</td>
<td>Member of the Legislature</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member de la Legislatura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN:* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**Member of the State Assembly**  
**Vote for One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET “MEG” WEBER, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestra de Guardería Infantil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Car Gripman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijador de Tranvías con Cables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assemblyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN:* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT**  
Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  
YES 123  NO 124

**FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT**  
Shall JOSEPH GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  
YES 126  NO 127

**FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT**  
Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  
YES 129  NO 130
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 132** | **NO 133** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 135** | **NO 136** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT | Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 138** | **NO 139** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE | Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 141** | **NO 142** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE | Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 144** | **NO 145** |
| FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 147** | **NO 148** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 150** | **NO 151** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO | Shall **ALLISON MARTIN “AL” ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | **YES 153** | **NO 154** |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE | Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 158 | NO 159 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE | Shall JAMES B. SCOTT be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 161 | NO 162 |
| FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR | Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 164 | NO 165 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR | Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNELL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 167 | NO 168 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR | Shall M. O. SABRAW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 170 | NO 171 |
| FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE | Shall HARRY W. LOW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 173 | NO 174 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE | Shall ZERNE P. HANING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 176 | NO 177 |
| FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE | Shall DONALD B. KING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | YES 179 | NO 180 |
## Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artista / Artista</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY” JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOJO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do not vote for more than five candidates for supervisor.**

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## (MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委员会
### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Education Details</th>
<th>Vote for No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educador/Padre/Educador</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA / 管理硕士, 注册会计师</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMANN LOUIE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教师/工程师</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educativo 教育家</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo 现任教育委员</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education, College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación, Administradora de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## (MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD) 社区大学校董
### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Education Details</th>
<th>Vote for No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educativo 教育家</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIOORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo 现任校董</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 现任校董</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo 现任校董</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律师</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educativo 教育家</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## (MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灵区快车系统董事
### Member, Board of Directors BART District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Education Details</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo 现任董事</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律师/公共交通倡导者</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 会计顾问</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PERON</td>
<td>Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Políticas 政策研究分析员</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation, Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $7 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in these amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation, Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of the loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,300,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $400,000,000?</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11 PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

**62**

**63**

**64**

**65**

**A**

**B**

**C**

**D**

**E**

---

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

**4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1996**

---

1. **261** SI | 262 NO
2. **263** SI | 264 NO
3. **265** SI | 266 NO
4. **267** SI | 268 NO
5. **269** SI | 270 NO
6. **271** SI | 272 NO
7. **273** SI | 274 NO
8. **275** SI | 276 NO
9. **277** SI | 278 NO
10. **279** SI | 280 NO
11. **281** SI | 282 NO
12. **283** SI | 284 NO
13. **285** SI | 286 NO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿Debe ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de “beneficios recíprocos de jubilación” para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿Debe la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausentan de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿Debe ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿Debe ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿Debe eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿Debe eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota.

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿Debe adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevas oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitidas bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿Debe imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEPS

STEP 1

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

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

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

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

STEP 4

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

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

E 第四步
投票选举之后，把选票取出，放入空白袋内，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格须为投票人填写。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America’s safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART’s farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART’s best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½ % BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committee member I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don’t work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessy
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members soda Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO
My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.
My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character I have and will have. Feinstein’s charters plans for good business and experience with property interests help districts represent the able city in the william brown, Jr.

RAYMOND COATS
My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jediah Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Delson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

VOTER SELECTION CARD (continued)

Supervisor

(1) 
(2) 
(3) 
(4) 
(5) 

Board of Education

(1) 
(2) 
(3) 

Comm. College Board

(1) 
(2) 
(3) 

BART Board (if any)

(1) 

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS

YES NO

53 235 236
54 238 239
55 241 242
56 244 245
57 247 248
58 250 251
59 252 253
60 255 256
61 259 260
62 261 262
63 263 264
64 266 267
65 269 270

CITY PROPOSITIONS

YES NO

A 273 274
B 276 277
C 279 280
D 282 283
E 285 286
F 287 288
G 290 291
H 293 294
I 296 297
J 299 300
K 302 303
L 305 306
M 308 309

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minster. Warren L.
Baxter, 245 Hunter Ave., Recreation. Joseph W. Davis,
88 Ralston St. Lee S. Dolson, 1501 Beach St., College
Professor. Linda J. Edgar, 30 Thrift St., Labor. G. R.
Furlough, 479 Otriza Ave., Barber. B. E. Harris, 900
McAllister St., Deacon. Jeri Jackson, 2637 22nd St.,
Recreation. Lewis Jackson, 285 Broad St., Custodian.
Terri Knight, 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. Timmy
Knight, 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. Joseph Lett,
232 Tara St., Retired. Jasper Lewis, 166 Bright St.,
Retired. Louise Lewis, 166 Bright St., Merchant. Carol
A. McGinty, 536 Munich St., Cashier. David Mitchell,
356 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. Louise M. Nobles,
235 Otriza Ave., Clerk-Typist. William Ring,
2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. Gladys M. Robinson,
244 Grafton St., Retired. Ennis Sandle, 17 Broad
St., Retired. Rosalie Smith, 276 Sagamore St.,
Homemaker. Alfred Strickland, Sr., 245 Minerva St.,
Dry Cleaners. Earlene Strickland, 245 Minerva St.,
Dry Cleaning. Leroy Stump, Jr., 43 Brighton Ave.,
Merchant. Oranle Willey, 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Robert L. Landa, 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. Modesto
Lanzon, 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. Norman
T. Larson, 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investors.
Hubert (Bert) Levenson, 2630 Laguna St., M.D.
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Executive.
Clemente Newhall-Oregon, 3060 California St.,
Nancy Pettern, 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. Jo
Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. Michael D.
Shaw, 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. Melvin M. Swig,
201 Locust St., Hotel Management. Susan Willis, 991
Innes Ave., Retired. Richard J. Zee, 24 Annapolis Ter.,
Insurance Broker.

Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. Judith
Ostapiak, 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. Mary Jo Sauced,
445 Hugo St., Florist. Jan Sapoling, 260 Bay St.,
Clerk-Typist. Warren Q. Sexto, 1445 Hyde St., Mort-
gage Officer. Daniel R. Toomey, 2929 Buchanan St.,
Police Officer. Helen K. Vaughn, 51 Edman Ct., As-
set Manager. Roderick V. Wallace, 220 Charter Oak
Ave., Cashier. George Weaver, 165 North Point St.,
Apartment Maintenance.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeeman I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:
- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. As long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ¼% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975. Spinosa has campaigned for:
- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
VOTER SELECTION CARD
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Supervisor
(1)________________________
(2)________________________
(3)________________________
(4)________________________
(5)________________________

Board of Education
(1)________________________
(2)________________________
(3)________________________

Comm. College Board
(1)________________________
(2)________________________
(3)________________________

BART Board (if any)
(1)________________________

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.
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Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood businesses and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am directly interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.
Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.
With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I must achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.
I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO
My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW “DADDY” JONES
My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handymen Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections. A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES
My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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BILL MAHER
My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS
My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration — actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer — I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor — having direct knowledge of the issues.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs — funded by the Mayor and the Board — to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I have developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28

My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebleeder on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain.

In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:
Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:


NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 325 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. We've helped improve our public health care system, created a need for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:


DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public".

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—no nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters’ income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64. Defend workers’ rights against employers.
No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there is still a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________________________Apt. #________
Address__________________________________________
Telephone No. (required)__________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐
Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s):________________________
Second choice locations (if any)________________________

Signature________________________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:


JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politizition going on at the College today. I have tried to see spent most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:


ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3000 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discriminated BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinaro."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and are not checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Velasquez are:


ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:


PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in private bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Juli C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

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

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:
Louis F. Batsmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, Retired.
Harry W. Fruechte, 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. Warren W. White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. Ralph O. Hillman, 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, Retired.
John J. Brady, 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean.
J. H. Conley, 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head.
Peter C. Gardner, 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head.
Madeline Mueller, 163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head.
Grover Klemmer, 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head.
Lawrence B. Wong, 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&D Dept. Head. Edward Dierauf, 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor.
Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor.
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor.
Julius J. Jelinek, 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Eng. Instructor.
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor.
Veronika Hunnicutt, 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor.
N. D. Degendorfer, 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Eng. Instructor.
Stephen R. Levinson, 17 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor.
C.F. Maloney, 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor.
Manfred E. Mueller, 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor.
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney.
Frank J. Surina, 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. John Statterly, 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFPD Fireman.
Ike Felser, 2071 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor.
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy Board to Mayor of Equalization Member.
Arthur J. Goedewagen, 2283 37th Ave., President & Education Executive Action Committee. Maie V. Spohn, 350 Battery St., Volunteer for Agreed Commission.
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO, Cecilia B. Hochhausen, 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness. I am a proud resident of San Francisco, and deeply involved in our schools.

My colleges elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco Board of Education. Under my leadership, we have been able to bring about significant improvements in our public schools.

My promise to you is to continue to work for the best interests of our children and our schools.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
James M. Foster, 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff.
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. Antonio E. Juanillo, 5 Montecito Ave., President of Sierra Institute.
Lawrence H. Reene, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
James A. Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City’s public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University.
I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of the Downtown Community College, and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student’s spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in schools and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students’ ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:
Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher/Homemaker.
Verna Marlowe, 1636 J Street, Homemaker.
Frederick W. Walters, 306-A Pine St., Electronic Tech.
Loretta Hino, 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee.
Dorothy V. Ryan, 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant.
Louis Green, 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife.
Dorothy J. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher.
Kenneth L. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist.
Richard Riley, 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent.
Dorothy Tischer, 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife.
Raul Montalvo, 53 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee.
Harold A. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner.
Ruth Greenwood, 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber.
Jeanette Briscoe, 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk.
Richard W. Shuttleworth, 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman.
Theresa R. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business.
Fred R. Briscoe, 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express.
Dorothy F. Bridgegan, 457 Myra Way, Secretary.
Alfred R. Springs, 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service.
Richard A. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel.
Hazel E. Hurd, 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk.
Barbara Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife.
Joseph M. Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman.
Robert Barnes, 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager.
Al Borvci, 234 Gates St., Attorney.
Willie Lewis Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer.
Sala Burton, 8 Stott Blvd., in Congress. Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
Naomi T. Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner.
Grandale A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP.
Frederick E. Jordan, 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer.
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU.
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor.
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director.
John L. Molinar, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor.
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Union President.
Arlo Smith, 66 San Francisco Way, District Attorney.
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education.
Yori Wada, 545 4th Ave., U.S. Regent.
Ansel Walker, 1643 Gilman Ave., Pastor.
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Supervisor.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Madison Ave., Community Activist.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilgert Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physicist/Parent.
Dr. Ames C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board.
Lewis B. Butler, 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor.
James Corey Busch, 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive.
Eileen Caplan, 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist.
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
John Yeh Chiu Chin, 3464 Lyon St., School Principal.
Harry J. Chuck, 920 Sacramento St., Presbytery Minister.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Steven J. Del, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
Isabel Hale, 1752 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner.
Johnnie B. Johnson, 10 Quickstop Lane, Businesswoman.
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor.
Ann Blumenstein Lazarus, 65 5th Ave., Businessman.
Rev. James Leach, 195 Borica Way, Minister.
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council.
Peter J. Nardozza, 4086 26th St., Administrator.
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant.
Lawrence J. Simi, 358 Ulloa St., Parent.
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education.
Marie Toulouse, 515 47th Ave., Union Official.
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.S. Regent.
Ron Wakahayashi, 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., UC Professor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilgert Ave., Minister.
Hannah A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian).
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

THREE VOTES NEEDED: Yes 273, No 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest $38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when—the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High-pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery power packs so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howard, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidently, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bol, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Lитеhiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Haisled, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDowall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteve
Delph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco. Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City. When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906. Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes. Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunin
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan

Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Krebesberger
Ed F. Putnam
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevelo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster — earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.
Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foss, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude! Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Caldén, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastro...
Moscone Center Financing

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276  NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption $140,000,000
- Bond Interest $145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement $285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS. A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.
Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Francisco citizens.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $10,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayers depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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42
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents. These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stagehands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Green Dorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here. Vote YES on B!

William F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention centers to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The underpinning of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newstands operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lula Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money else

where in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco’s big hotels. They’ve overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don’t let anyone tell you this isn’t a tax increase just because it’s the hotel tax and not your property tax that’s going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing. Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven’t we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.
Vote NO.
Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONC CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

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

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279

NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called “refunding”. It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don’t last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A “Yes” vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable
The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a court, or a duty constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
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Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?  

YEA 282  
NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco’s open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco’s children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

– It doesn’t cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
– It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
– It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It’s time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs — keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City — from Hunter’s Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I’m voting “yes” on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Glyod, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy. Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being. Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments. The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up. For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers. Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults. For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities. Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

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

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Carhartos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denehein
Joanne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sedonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children—close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco’s children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOLLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Robotto Estevs, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Denis M. Collins
Patricia Arco
R. Hunter Mory.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco’s after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Bruce Rafus, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco’s children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children’s lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurado
Commissioner Carla T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguirer Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children’s safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won’t cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco’s schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents’ Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Cohnert
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O’Connor
Mary M. O’Connor
Darrell J. Salomom
E. Porcher Hester
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space... None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinters Flitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Timney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Canyon
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #64
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Fialkner
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $5000 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
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Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F
Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law? YES 287 NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXTH OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.
Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to
enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon    Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00    Proposition A — Fire Protection Bonds
2:10    Proposition B — Moscone Center Expansion
2:30    Proposition C — Bond Refinancing
2:35    Proposition D — Playground Funding
2:50    Proposition E — Retirement Pay
2:55    Proposition F — Retirement Benefits
3:00    Proposition G — Union-Time Pensions
3:05    Proposition H — Pay Equity
3:20    Proposition I, J — Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30    Proposition K — Art Curator
3:35    Proposition M — Planning Issues
3:50    Proposition N — Oil Facilities
PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290
NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
Employee Reps. Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA
Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hemburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevans
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwayne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

About the Ballot Arguments

Unofficial Matter:
Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?
Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.
Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative “worth”.

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker’s pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission’s annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of “comparable worth” and “pay equity.” I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It’s a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn’t contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can’t do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let’s try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.
Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.
Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.
Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.
Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Tobias Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mesey
Carol Mesey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Wilde B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Ceballos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ajile, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borsellino
Sandy Onye Mori

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Hommersy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau

Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men. Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements. The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Caralien Testor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huse, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirschberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margot Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Opljen, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Dufly, Eqx
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads... "notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter..." This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?
Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296

NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officers’ and firefighter’s salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn’t always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer’s and firefighter’s wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California’s 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It’s about time we corrected this unfair situation. It’s time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy

Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey. Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year. This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

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

It's not fair. Firefighters and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day. Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Colden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officials. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting YES on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I
Police & Fire Age Requirements

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299

NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne,
Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

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

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nenereoski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurant
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Velensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Philip Agger, Artist
Poule Anglin Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresita Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Casile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earle-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Kee, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artistic Director
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Wun Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkovsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarren, Director, Artspace
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PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or burden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 320(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City’s politics and the City’s economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City’s Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exceptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced “one-crop” economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen’s initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaigns made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Fat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park — there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983 — during the last anti-highrise campaigns — the new, so-called “controls” in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 exist-

ing parking spaces for destruction.

Don’t be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman O’Rei
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Beluanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Piacur, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Reenie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Rosenburg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thelen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cat O'Korie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Anelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods — higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity. VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosiar, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wesser, Towne Tub Lalandramut

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men — 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women — but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Ella Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

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

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattananization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattananization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattananization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco
• tens of thousands of jobs;
• lower housing costs;
• smaller tax burden;

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the

- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco’s Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City’s poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar, Al Borvice, Marie Acosta Colon, Tony Colon, Mike Garza, Robert Gonzalez, Jose Medina, Jim Morales, Celso Ortiz, Alfredo Rodriguez, Gloria Rodriguez, Gene Royale, Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-tenured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

—Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
—Anza Vista Improvement Club
—Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
—Cow Hollow Improvement Association
—Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
—District One Political Action (Richmond District)
—Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
—Friends of Noe Valley
—Glen Park Association
—Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
—Nob Hill Neighbors
—Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
—North Beach Neighbors
—North Mission Association
—Pacific Heights Residents Association
—Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
—Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
—Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
—Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
—Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
—Telegraph Hill Dwellers
—Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That’s why City Hall is so afraid of it. That’s also why they are lying to you.

They don’t want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn’t.

They don’t want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don’t want you to know that YOUR priorities aren’t THEIR priorities. And that it’s not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it’s important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City’s zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned “Heavy Industrial.”

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don’t listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chin
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Eileen Baugherman
Hank Barnard

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brundon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnisk
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Shephard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Linda Whisler, Stonestown Tenants Association
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravina
Kayren Hudibburgh

Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Bill Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza

Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City’s ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City’s job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Judy Bostom
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Joe Medina
Dennis Moscofan
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duquece Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Peninsula Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Ames
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Parsley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumbartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunswasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conit
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Covan
San Crilolase
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebein
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Reaser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betsy Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Horr
Don Hodapp
Jan and Murray Holloway
John Holzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Houston
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jellnek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolies
David Jones
Elyane Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadiash
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kase Montico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krutchez
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Rash
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Love

Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphine MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Non McGahe
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mishak
Tim Malina
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Mosk
Jane Mckaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurie
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
Jane Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Maclaffy Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Storin
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Straussner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Thistle
Marie Uziga
David Veale
Joel Ventressa
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkman Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wulfer
Doris Brian Walker
Phyliss Walker
Rich Walker
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Warner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wattrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rossalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yarman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects - Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

* Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of
Planning Initiative

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination In Place**

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

_Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr._

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

_Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor_

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City’s neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

_Supervisor Wendy Nelder_

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

_W.F. O'Keefe Sr., President_  
_San Francisco Taxpayers Association_
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from closing dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little effect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY

James Haas
Michael Bernick
Mark Buell

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

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.

2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses”—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of “sugar coating” will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City’s workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandra P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luise Esquiro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Pooito, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

**Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs**

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

**Proposition M Means Lost Revenues**

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $177 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

**There is an alternative to Proposition M**

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Furthermore, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

**Vote No on Proposition M.**

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

**Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!**

City planning is an ongoing process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

**Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.**

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

**Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.**

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

**Vote No on Proposition M.**

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M**

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our city depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $17 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Haakon L. Reenberg, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corliss, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donohy, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichbaum, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Wilson Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mantis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Piano, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scotta, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Starin, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappello
Kenneth Spraul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group
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Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco’s public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rina Ahlvar
H. Jesse Arinelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chiu
Lily Cunio
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Duckor, Administrator
Terry A. Fricke, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Hermon L. Griffith, Retired
James C. Hormel

Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Clausen Jerman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplans, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Mermoroski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Ormeño, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Petronio, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamashiki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Meyers, Attorney
Caryl Meyers

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of “neighborhood power” Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Potrero Hill Neighbors Against Proposition M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can’t improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we’ve got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fang, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Lindy F. Eise
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a loser and deserves to be defeated.

Bayview Neighbors Against Proposition M

Muhammed Ali Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Sponsor
Elouise Westbroek, Retired
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Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308

NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilin- gual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hengsbo, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinaro, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanage- ment: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.
Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, barging, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCREASE THE DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-85, $46,200,000:

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of said special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil. If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds or more of the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 percent per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Kenealy
Deputy City Attorney
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PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; or lands on the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and, on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8539.1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1967 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.
8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.
The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.
8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropri-ations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in sub-section (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons em-ployed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section, by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.561 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretion-ary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant there-after, such member shall receive the rate of compen-sation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certifica-tion the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities in-cluded in the certified report of the civil service commis-sion who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commis-sion divided by the number of cities in said cer-tification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a). In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the max-imum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, shall be fixed:

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensa-tion paid firefighter classifications in regular ser-vice in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commis-sion for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-lars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hose-men, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire depart-ment" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.561 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of depart-ment, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritori-ous conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of cap-tain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13 %) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of com-pensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bu-reau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10 %) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this sec-tion. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional amendment of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (b), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(3) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission.

The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided; however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time; not to exceed six months; after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.100.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States:

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States:

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitled them under the civil service rules to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2; Fireman; and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 16, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25; Class H2; Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment:

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said twenty-five years being computed under Section 8.559.10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retiree.
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. 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 wife 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 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.586-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent 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 wife 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.
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PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(C) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tant employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order.

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8,400 and 8,401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointment officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) Alterations in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(g) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employment of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8,300(g) and 8,450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(i) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(j) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(k) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(m) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exhibition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322. (c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects. (d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero. (e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero. Section 321.2 is amended as follows: SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)
(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1). Section 321.3 is amended as follows: SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election. Section 325 is amended as follows: SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election. PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows: Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows: SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed. Subsections 164(d) and (e) are amended as follows: (d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of $50,000 or more gross square feet of office space. PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application thereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.
The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.
(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.
(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.
If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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## Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Educadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Comm. College Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Gobernador, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegovernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>College Instructor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Author Autora 作家</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom
Organizer, Community Organizer
Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California

RAY CULLEN, Libertarian
Certified Public Accountant
Contador Público Certificado

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent
Aviator
Aviador

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian
Attorney, Private Practice
Abogado, Despacho Propio

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom
Lawyer
Abogado

BRUCE GLEASON, Republican
Attorney-at-Law
Abogado

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic
Attorney General, California
Procurador General, California

GARY R. ODOM, American Independent
Attorney
Abogado

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic
Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican
Business Executive/Controller
Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom
Medical Relief Coordinator
Coordinador de Asistencia Médica

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian
Financial Consultant  財務顧問

EDWARD B. “ED” VALLN, American Independent
Director, Patriotic Committee  藝術家委員會主任

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic
United States Senator  美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom
Socialist Organizer  社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican
U.S. Congressman  法國衆議員

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

SALA BURTON, Democratic
Representative in Congress 5th District  美國眾議員

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian
Electronics Technician  電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican  法國衆議員

THEODORE “TED” ZUUR, Peace and Freedom
Worker  工人

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET “MEG” WEBER</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

**For Chief Justice of the Supreme Court**

| Shall Rose Elizabeth Bird be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| YES 123                         | NO 124                          |

**For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court**

| Shall Joseph Grodin be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| YES 126                         | NO 127                          |

**For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court**

<p>| Shall Stanley Mosk be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| YES 129                         | NO 130                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supreme Court Justices</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall Malcolm M. Lucas be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall Cruz Reynoso be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall Edward A. Panelli be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall William A. Newsom be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall John W. Holmdahl be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice</td>
<td>Shall John Anthony Kline be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall John E. Benson be elected to the office for the term prescribed</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice</td>
<td>Shall Allison Martin &quot;Al&quot; Rouse be elected to the office for the term</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Opponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
<td>Robert W. Merrill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
<td>James B. Scott</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>Carl West Anderson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>William R. Channell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>M. O. Sabraw</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Harry W. Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Zerne P. Haning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Donald B. King</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 與立女性人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 住民黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología 犯罪學學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 拿督博士／女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 副地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(MIEBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員</th>
<th>教育委員</th>
<th>請選最多 3 人</th>
<th>Vote for no más de 3</th>
<th>Vote for No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, Board of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/ Director de Servicios para Jovenes</td>
<td>青少年服務主任</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educatar/ Padre/Educador</td>
<td>家長／教育家</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA/ 教育管理碩士，註冊公共會計師</td>
<td>教育管理碩士，註冊公共會計師</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/ Presidente, Consejo de Educación</td>
<td>舊金山教育局主席</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUIE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/ Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras</td>
<td>電腦公司總裁</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/ Maestro/ Ingeniero</td>
<td>教師／工程師</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educatar</td>
<td>教育家</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/ En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>現任教育委員</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education/ College Administrator/ Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(MIEBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董</th>
<th>社區大學校董</th>
<th>請選最多 3 人</th>
<th>Vote for no más de 3</th>
<th>Vote for No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, Community College Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educatar</td>
<td>教育家</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIODAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/ Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad</td>
<td>社區大學校董</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/ Small Businessman/ Abogado/ Comerciante</td>
<td>律師／公共商務人士</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educatar</td>
<td>教育家</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(MIEBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事</th>
<th>灣區快車系統董事</th>
<th>請選 1 人</th>
<th>Vote por uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, Board of Directors BART District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>現任董事</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Attorney/Transit Advocate/ Abogado / Promotor de Transito</td>
<td>律師／公共交通顧問</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Controller-Financial Consultant/ Contralor-Consultante Financiero</td>
<td>主計員／財務顧問</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PERON</td>
<td>Policy Research Analyst/ Investigador y Analista de Políticas</td>
<td>政策研究分析員</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residents. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPUESTAS A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE ESQUIVELS ELECTRICOS. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (53)

236 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO DE ESQUIVELS ELECTRICOS. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (54)

238 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRENDAS. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (55)

239 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRENDAS. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (56)

241 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (57)

242 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (58)

244 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (59)

245 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (60)

247 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (61)

248 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (62)

250 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (63)

251 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (64)

252 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (65)

253 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (66)

255 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (67)

256 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (68)

259 SI  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (69)

260 NO  
LEY DE EJIDO DE BANCOS OESTE-HUACHICLO DE 1846 PARA FINANCIAR REJILLAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cincuenta mil pesos de albañil (500,000 pesos) para financiar la construcción e instalación de las instalaciones de los bancos de electricidad en el Estado de California. Incluye la emisión de certificados para los intereses pagaderos a los titulares de los bonos. (70)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1983. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 261 NO 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 263 NO 264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 266 NO 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 269 NO 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 273 NO 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $460,000,000?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 276 NO 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 279 NO 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 282 NO 283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 285 NO 286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPÓSITOS A SER SOMETIDOS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
<th>Date 11/4/1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI Aceptar</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO Rechazar</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI Aceptar</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO Rechazar</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSICIONES ESTATELES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
<th>Date 11/4/1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>SI Aceptar</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>NO Rechazar</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI Aceptar</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO Rechazar</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
<th>Date 11/4/1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI Aceptar</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>NO Rechazar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **IMPUESTOS LOCALES:** Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentar los actuales, los gobiernos locales en los condados deben aportar los dos terceros partes del voto popular. (Impuestos especiales)  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

2. **UDOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO:** Requiere que todas las leyes y regulaciones del Estado se sometan al voto popular. Si es aceptado este acuerdo, el voto se realizará en el próximo año.  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

3. **SÍNDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUISITIVA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS):** Declara que el estado de abril de 1986 en un estado de América Latina y al óvulo de impuestos y de empeño de enfermedades. Impuesto fiscal. El costo de esta propuesta virtualmente 20 millones de dólares.  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

4. **RESTRICIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICIÓN A SUSTANCIAS TÓXICAS:** (Proposta)  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

5. **BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986:** Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejorar el sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

6. **¿Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Conveniones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reurbanización (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?**  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

7. **¿Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?**  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

8. **¿Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos o espacios abiertos?**  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar

9. **¿Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron dos meses antes de que la propuesta proporcional?**  
   - SI Aceptar  
   - NO Rechazar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law? <strong>YES 287</strong>  <strong>NO 288</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? <strong>YES 290</strong>  <strong>NO 291</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey? <strong>YES 293</strong>  <strong>NO 294</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date? <strong>YES 296</strong>  <strong>NO 297</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments? <strong>YES 299</strong>  <strong>NO 300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong> Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? <strong>YES 302</strong>  <strong>NO 303</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition L was removed from the ballot.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong> Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan? <strong>YES 305</strong>  <strong>NO 306</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? <strong>YES 308</strong>  <strong>NO 309</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>ABREVIATURA</th>
<th>RESOLUCIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad las limites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresen en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eximir a la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

La propuesta L fue eliminada de la balota.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>ABREVIATURA</th>
<th>RESOLUCIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL DE LA BALOTA
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

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

STEP 4

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

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

After voting, place the ballot card inside the envelope pocket with the stub showing.

D 第三步

将带针之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白袋內，票尾凸出在外。

Envelopes exist. 有空白信封為投票人使用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America’s safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART’s farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART’s best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ¼% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committee member I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:
• Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
• Escalators and change machines that often don’t work.
• Rising BART crime rate.
• Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
• Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:
• Supervisor John Molinar
• Sheriff Michael Hennessey
• District Attorney Arlo Smith
• Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
• School Board Members Sedonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
• College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
• Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:
• Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
• Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
• Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

(continued)

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>123  124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>126  127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>129  130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>132  133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>135  136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>138  139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>144  145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate (if any)</td>
<td>147  148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>150  151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153  154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158  159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161  162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164  165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167  168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170  171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173  174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176  177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179  180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinari’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.
Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSPU Public Research Institute.
With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Susan Brady Alfaro, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer.
David D. Ardoin, 399 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor.
Robert B. Bacci, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney.
Lois A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Developer.
Jack Casford, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant.
Frances A. Condon, 2501 21st Ave., Housewife.
Kathleen Cormier, 321 Richland Ave., Writer.
Lee S.olson, Ph.D., 150 Beach St., Professor, Belle Hall, 1000 Green St., Investor.
Rick Hauptman, 1059 Noe St., Computer Manager.
Robert L. Hogan, 3975 Clay St., Consultant.
Jennifer C. Houston, 22 Delgado St., Consultant.
Henrietta O'dell Humphreys, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor.
Walter G. Zebe, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman.
Donald J. Law, 540 19th Ave., Attorney.
Richard N. Lerner, 67 Wawona St., Consultant.
Levy Looper, 827 Guerrero St., Director.
Richard William Lowry, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant.
John N. Noaman, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver.
Linda M. Radigan, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications.
William J. Rapaglia, 2094 Green St., Developer.
Linda M. Robertson, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer.
Nancy Schelholtz, 2340 Pacific Ave., Writer/Producer.
Daniel Schuch, 4109 24th St., President Carpenters.
Mervyn E. Silverman, 19 Frederick St., Physician.
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher.
Magle Sonler, 4388 17th St., School Worker.
Donald N. Strauss, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Charles E. Butte, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst.
R.C. Caesar, 150 Topeta St., Dentist.
Levy D. Cagnone, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator.
Gordon Chin, 60 Castro St., Executive Director.
Jack W. Colbert, 250 Thir St., Fund Raiser.
Harry V. Chuck, 920 Sacramento St., Minister.
Jerome G. DeFilippo, 610 15th Ave., Retired.
Doreen Der-McLeod, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker.
James Fang, 177 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Maria Garnder, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer.
Alfred Gee, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker.
Kathleen A. Gee, 606 15th Ave., Nurse.
Thomas H. Gee, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired.
Eva Y. Gardner, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer.
Eva V. Gardner, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer.
Alfred Gee, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker.
Kathleen A. Gee, 606 15th Ave., Nurse.
Thomas H. Gee, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired.
Jennie Chin Husse, 434 31st Ave., Administrator.
Gilbert S. Lee, 702 33rd Ave., Physician.
Harry Lee, 155 Alton Ave., Physician.
Jonathan L. Li, 119 Mendosa St., Physician.
Susan G. Lim, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liaison.
Russell Matsumoto, 127 Sweeney St., Attorney.
Inez McClaren, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher.
Avery Taylor Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect.
Thomas G. Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant.
Allen M. Okamoto, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker.
Frank R. Passantino, 411 Marin Blvd., Dentist.
Bok F. Pon, 435 14th Ave., Businessman.
David Prowler, 544 Union St., City Planner.
William H. Pryor, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director.
merry E. Silverman, 19 Frederick St., Physician.
Hori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker.
Linda Bartholomew, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress.
Carol Arthur Bjornson, 21 Papan St., Hardware Specialist.
Conception B. Calhais, 763 Vasta St., Customs Aid.
Virginia Carroll, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson.
Georgia Castillo, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator.
Julietta C. DeJesus, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate.
John M. Gonzales, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist.
John Green, 773 Lisbon St., Retired.
Robert V. Karp, 530 Brussels St., Deacon.
Michael Mather, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver.
Charlidon David McKay, 161 1st Ave., Doorman.
Ramona Michaels, 331 Bacon St., Secretary.
James Muscat, Jr., 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired.
Barbara Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader.
Vernon M. Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter.
Dolores Robles, 217 Felton St., Homemaker.
Ernest R. Robles, 217 Felton St., Steward.
Rev. William H. Roth, 522 Shotwell St., Minister.
Darryl Franklin Sanchez, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary.
Clarence Cornelius Smith, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver.
Robert Valade, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer.
Teresita C. Virenna, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper.
Helen C. Walker, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly.
Panchita Rae Wright, 500 Goghtting St., Homemaker.
Judy J. Xuereb, 251 Harford St., Bank Teller.
Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF. Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I would like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections. A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self-evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keys standing at the door. Let me in to sup' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:


The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER
My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS
My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militaryization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco — not the downtown interests. Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987. My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals. My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

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

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities.
I make San Francisco work for everyone.
— I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:
Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor, Javier A. Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker, Giuliana Black, 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter, Louise Bruguione, 1773 Mason St., Business Owner, Jean E. Burke, 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant, Donald Caride, 4066 25th St., Student, K. C. Endres, 3550 California St., Psychiatrist, Robin Endres, 3550 California St., Bank Teller, Teresa D. Fennelly, 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant, Beth Garvey, 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor, Herman Hoh, 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner, Nora Ann Howard, 6038 California St., Peace Activist, Rebecca Kondos, 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager, Simon C. Leo, 1424 California St., Taxi Driver, Laura Mankikar, 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant, Barbara Matison, 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. Jack G. Pekarek, 2841 Sacramento St., Nee Valley Merchant, Linda Ranney, 65 Gates St., Merchant, George M. Ray, 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator, Trudi Richards, 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist, Margaret Rivera, 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant, David E. Roberts, 799 Ashbury St., Photographer, Carol J. Sanderson, 3337-B 17th St., Teacher, James A. Schmidt, 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center, Roger Smart, 1977 McAllister St., Clerk, Richard A. Wall, 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.
Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco’s population and the future of San Francisco.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I’ve enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I’ve worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I’ve helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I’ve helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I’ll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly.
Robert F. Barry, 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association.
Miriam Blautstein, 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors.
Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer.
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress.
Agnipino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education.
Angela Coppola, 2018 Bush St., Business Executive.
Carlotta Texidor del Puerto, 84 Berkeley Way., Educator.
Lee S. Dolson, 1501 Beach St., College Professor.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor.
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister.
Mike Hardeman, 329 Wawona St., Union Official.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff.
Richard D. Hofling, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor.
Carl Michael Housh, 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant.
Isabel Hule, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner.
Gordon Juan, M.D., 1838 11th Ave., Physician.
Gilman Grant Louie, 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President.
Rick Pacurur, 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator.
Roland Quinn, 407 35th Ave., CPA.
Kathleen Owyan Turner, 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist.
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Foot St., University Professor.
Sondula M. Wilson, 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education.
Chantale Y.M. Wong, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.
Samson W. Wung, 1851 11th Ave., Student.
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist.
Henry Yep, 150 24th Ave., Accountant.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly.
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
John L. Molinaro, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Mike Hardeman, 329 Wawona St., Supervisor.
Carol Ruther Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Dr. Amos C. Brown, Ill Lunado Wy., Pastor.
VP Community College Board. Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid St., Consultant.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor.
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney.
John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Mike Hardeman, 329 Wawona St., Union Official.
Agar Jakels, 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director.
Rev. Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor.
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Suntana Ave., Attorney.
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Administrator.
Sandra A. Morris, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator.
Juanita Owens, 371-A Corderidge St., Educator.
Sol Rossell, 45 Bache St., Union Representative.
Thomata N. Scott, 1912-16 Broderick St., Program Monitor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitras Av., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
- Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
- Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
- Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
- Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
- Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
- Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name___________________________

Address_________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)__________

Do you have an automobile?  yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________

Second choice locations (if any)______________________________

Signature________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Joh...
CANDIDATES FOR COLLEGE BOARD

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained by uniting the effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:


ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:


Paul Wotman

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent

My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

JULIE C. ANDERSON

(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Julie C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

The sponsors for Greg Day are:
CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ullola Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are falling in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

THE SPONSORS FOR WILLIAM FELZER ARE:

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

THE SPONSORS FOR MYRA KOPF ARE:

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

THE SPONSORS FOR GILMAN LOUIE ARE:
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College, John Veh Hall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Banker. R. Hunter Morey, 315 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator, Melvin L. Washington, 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales, Juan R. Martinez, 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager, Ralph Engler, 742 8th Ave., Police Officer, Despinder Sekhon, 380 16th Ave., Banker, Bok F. Pun, 435 14th Ave., Businessman, Michael A. Kelly, 145 22nd Ave., Attorney, Shirley Shigeo Murakami, 833 44th Ave., Secretary, Lawrence G. Barbu, 2409 Scott St., Consultant, Kristen R. Coston, 2444 Highway, Student, Kay Kello Onishi, 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist, Angela Chu, 525 Judah St., Social Worker, Phuong Vyen Le, 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU, Kenneth R. Hanson, 435 Warren Dr., Grocer, George M. Eastes, 1818 Page St., Printer, Faustino C. Sueld, 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic, Louis Hop Lee, 788 18th Ave., Lawyer, Angela G. Rand, 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner, Michael D. Denton, 127 Steiner St., Salesman, Ricky Wong, 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent, Dorothy M. Campbell, 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired, Joseph S. Quan, 574 18th Ave., Retired, Susan D. Lee, 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer, Sammy A. Castillo, 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist, Wilbur Woo, 34 Marvel Court, Educator, George Okamoto, 151 22nd Ave., Merchant, Richard Sanchez M.D., 3450 21st St., Pediatrician, Albert Sun, 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:


SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

| Bond Redemption | $46,200,000 |
| Bond Interest   | $38,808,000 |
| Debt Service Requirement | $85,008,000 |

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless. Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumper can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter’s Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Giggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halsey, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0200 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litchiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salaro, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Hrubeman
Ralph Hurndulido
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas E. McDonough
Tony Kilrey
Leroy King
David Leoman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mesey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire...the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A...fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnston

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes:

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART’s a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

_A. Cecil Williams_, Glide United Methodist Church  
_Bob Barry_, President, S.F. Police Officers Association  
_William Corvin_, President, California Steam Company

_J. M. Eneman_, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors  
_George Foss_, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers  
_Rev. John L. Green_, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department  
_Albert S. Samuels, Jr._, Past President, Market Street Project  
_Harvey Matthews_, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club  
_Arthur Godewaagen_, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!  
Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!  
Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!  
Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

_William F. Murray_, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired  
_Keith P. Calden_, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired  
_Andrew C. Casper_, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catas-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City. Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

_Philip S. Day, Jr._  
_Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services  
_Richard Eisner_, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant  
_Jelena Panzete_, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee  
_Joe Possiliko_, Emergency Services, Salvation Army  
_Peter Ashen_, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:  
Proposition A — YES  
Proposition M — YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.  

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

_Donald J. Birrer_, Director of Public Works  
_Frank M. Jordan_, Chief of Police

_Terence Faulkner_, President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

_ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A_

_Dean Macris_, Director of Planning  
_Rudy Nothenberg_, General Manager, Public Utilities  
_William Stead_, General Manager, Municipal Railway  
_David Wenteorg, M.D.M.P.H.,_ Director of Public Health  
_James D. Conrey_, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000? YES 276 NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption $140,000,000
- Bond Interest 145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths (0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning — solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously — one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually — a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually — a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously — but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone...
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for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America’s convention and trade show industry. Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco’s economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and all San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City’s most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let’s protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let’s vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $500,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco’s worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don’t expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation’s convention industry.

There’s a lot at stake for San Francisco’s future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayer families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city’s economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzales, Mayor’s Special Assistant
Julie Ting, Member, College Board
Louis Hip Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents. These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers — the list goes on — because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business — money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 79R
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Maylan, Plasterers & Sheetmetal Workers Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Anido, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong — at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

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

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here. Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything. The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Brunkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobuchar
Robert Silvestri

Stanley Brunnwell
Tom Spinosa

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

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry. We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America’s favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city’s pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposal B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America’s most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lula Turner
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can’t fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Beth and Jim Granats
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it’s already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don’t even have a financing plan that doesn’t count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.
Vote NO.

Dong Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hesor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCON CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Polk Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279
NO 280

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down. The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
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PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties? YES 282 NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents. Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:
- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble. For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco’s Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco’s children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco’s after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children’s well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women’s Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women’s Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Willard Jiggles
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kof, President
A. Richard Cerbato, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Jensen
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sedonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support. Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco’s children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esavaes, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco’s after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafal, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco’s children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children’s lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Burmado
• Commissioner Carlos T. del Portillo
• Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
• Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
• Commissioner Joan Zamora Mouron
• Ricardo Hernandez
• Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
• Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children’s safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won’t cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco’s schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynne, President, San Francisco Parents’ Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Cobblett
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
• James E. O’Connor
• Mary M. O’Connor
• Darrell J. Salomon
• E. Porcher Hunter
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San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City. Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.
As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space ... None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.
In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

Y 285
N 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer’s & Shephard’s Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Intl. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner
Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago. All other retirees will be reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive “reciprocal pension benefits” under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Salta Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing Proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNC'NTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00 Proposition A — Fire Protection Bonds
2:10 Proposition B — Moscone Center Expansion
2:30 Proposition C — Bond Refinancing
2:35 Proposition D — Playground Funding
2:50 Proposition E — Retirement Pay
2:55 Proposition F — Retirement Benefits
3:00 Proposition G — Union-Time Pensions
3:05 Proposition H — Pay Equity
3:20 Proposition I, J — Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30 Proposition K — Art Curator
3:35 Proposition M — Planning issues
3:50 Proposition N — Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? YES 290  →  NO 291  →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Dorray Sowers
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwine

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries. It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker’s pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission’s annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It’s a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn’t contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can’t do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let’s try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year longstanding pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees’ salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees’ pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact “comparable worth” policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees’ salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That’s why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, St. Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominate by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H’s moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees’ salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
Joanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Berman, Commissioner
Agar Juicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mercy
Carol Mezey
Charlie Barruck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by non-minority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbuus, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jennie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Aparna Shan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees’ salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanyz
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau

Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male-dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carolina Tejedor del Portal, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart’s long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads . . . “notwithstanding . . . any provision of any other section of this charter . . .”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date? YES 296 NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer’s and firefighter’s salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn’t always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer’s and firefighter’s wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s about time we corrected this unfair situation. It’s time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissiioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I— Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you— our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Caden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299  ➞  NO 300  ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: "Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

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

PROPOSITION K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on “K”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability. Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification is able to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurant
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rokeby, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vodensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Phillip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Martoni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Pinkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spalding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galería de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305

NO 306

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It would also require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 per square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller’s Statement on “M”

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;
2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;
3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;
4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;
5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;
6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,
8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows,

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structure or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k)(5) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was legally under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of buildings, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City’s politics and the City’s economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City’s Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced “one-crop” economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen’s initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grosboll       Jim Morales
Dennis Antenore    Jack Morrison
Jim Handler        Pat Norman
Sue Hestor         Alan Raznick
Geraldine Johnson  Calvin Welch
Michael Lighty     Susan Weissberg
Esther Marks       Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called “controls” in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don’t be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rofle
Richard Stlar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made its a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Cappola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Herschman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucinari, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Renzie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thelen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Julie Anderson       Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
James Bell           Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Lois Blanchard       Enola Maxwell
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists A.J. Mitchell
Vera L. Clanton      Joel Mitchell
Terry Collins        Pat Norman
Darryl Cox           Donnie Okorie
Ina Dearman          Jim Queen
Michael Edwards      Joe Rudolph
Barbara Garner        Hiram Smith
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd Ida Strickland
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden Charles Turner, Jr.
Rev. Roland Gordon    Amelia A. Ward
Rev. Martin Grizzell  Stimeon White
Geraldine Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods — higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mostas, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wesser, Towne Tub Laundromat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City’s poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49c for every dollar earned by men — 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Pat Martin
Linda Post
Elsa Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives — higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

• tens of thousands of jobs;
• lower housing costs;
• smaller tax burden;
• better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
• a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city — I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighborhoods
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPOHLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chen
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lin
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gattigayn, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Jablonsky
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Shepard
Shirley St. George
Paul Warrell
LaDale Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Bostom
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravani
Kayren Hadlburgh

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Barton
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.
Hon. Sue Berman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin

Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Arasa Casa Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Neb Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sunset-Sierra Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunsetside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Agle
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Arment & Peter Parsley
Buck Bagot
John Bandis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barish
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Beletto
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blumgaist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Sela Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunswasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Chehne
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Coni
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertino
Zeth Cowan
San Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danakas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Dannebein
Arthur DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Dustin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Betsy Evans
Don Feuer
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tally Friedman
Edwin Gabaty
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marshu Gunland
Betty Garvey
Gusavlia Gash
Gabriel Getner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorotha Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Mar Marlow
John Heitzlaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike House

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurado
Sally Hayes
Carl Imparato
Joan Inraotor
AgarJaics
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Blaine Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadosh
Roberti Kus
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser

Jack H.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kursenbaum
Tony Killroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klugeman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Joan Kordum
Steven Kretting
Henry Kroll
Ira Karlanden
S.S. Kuhl
Mary Lane
Jim Lassonde
Norman Larson
Polly Laver
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linnenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Love

Joan Lombard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphie MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale
Connell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milaczo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Alan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinaro
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKeeble Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O’Brien
Cesar Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pucurur
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tih Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Sorefjani
Herb Schwarz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain

Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Serr
Tim Shirron
Janet Storm
Jaan Straizer
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Tiber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trefilley
Marie Utzic
David Veale
Joel Ventressa
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkman Jr.
Joan Von Brisen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brian Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Walter
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Wernic
Paul Wessel
Ann Weirich
Lyle Wing
Richard Witt
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. This would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,”” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

• Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
Planning Initiative

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.
- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**
In San Francisco, we’ve fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

*Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.*

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

*Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor*

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

*Supervisor Wendy Nelder*

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

*W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President*

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Proposition M will dramatically affect every part of the City’s economic base.
Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.
Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco’s neighborhoods.
San Francisco’s neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M’s priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the “existing neighborhood character.”

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco’s economy.
Our City’s small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:
• Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
• Proposition M’s priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
• Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.
The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don’t let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public’s uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and “take San Francisco back from the developers”. If their sincerity is beyond question, the naiveté is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little effect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco’s future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas Michael Bernick
Mark Buell

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

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornography shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low-cost childcare for working mothers. San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minority communities! Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Esquerrro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Catarina del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPONENT M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

**Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs**

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

**Proposition M Means Lost Revenues**

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

**Vote No on Proposition M.**

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPONENT M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

**Vote No on Proposition M.**

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Franciscans to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M**

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President, Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevenst Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Taplin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert F. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Arai
Jene Rina Alviar
H. Jesse Arnette, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frances Campagnoli, Attorney
Yoan-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Libby Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eichman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel

Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kogians, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Out Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Harburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamashita, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hnnvatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joanita Johnson, President, S.P. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Paul Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elaine Westbrook, Retired

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

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308
NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two-year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Lerner, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Section 2. Definitions.
*"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the following municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismically controlled improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges, the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; the installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000.

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precints, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

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

Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Keneley
Deputy City Attorney
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space elements of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the “Recreation and Open Space Programs” to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as “high-need neighborhoods”. Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Funds currently under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6400 (a)(5)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”, or lands on the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund’s existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current “Recreation and Open Space Program” no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in “high-need neighborhoods” identified in the then-current “Recreation and Open Space Program” is null and void.

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new. 8539.4 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Comming on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8507, 8509, 8584, 8586 or 8588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member’s effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the council may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year. Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the average maximum wages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest.
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(I) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further amendment of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (b), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(I) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal years 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that at this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman or operator on the municipal railways need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application. Examination or appointment must become resident within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.320-1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment as so determined December 14, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25. Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, may retire as to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
mental allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. 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 wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, after completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. 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 wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualifications therefor; (2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1965, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(7) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall hold his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation hereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charters or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to, all the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall become into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of said utility, shall become subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify to writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects. 

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet for approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(l) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability. If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.
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<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Aviador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED ZSCHAU, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRECK MCKINLEY, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKLIN “HARRY” ERNST III</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Publisher/Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

| (MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL)  
Member of the State Assembly | 請選 1 人  
Vote for One |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Vote 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>Vote 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF CORINO, Republican</td>
<td>Vote 119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. Vote 121

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT JUSTICES</td>
<td>(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall EDWARD A. PANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td>Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td>Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
<td>James B. Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
<td>Robert W. Merrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>Carl West Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>M. O. Sabraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
<td>William R. Channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Harry W. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Donald B. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
<td>Zerne P. Haning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR**

(WRITE-NO) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### (MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACIÓN) 教育委員

**Member, Board of Education**

- **MYRA KOPF**
  - President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación
  - 教育委員会主席
  - 210

- **GILMAN LOUIE**
  - Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras
  - 電腦公司董事
  - 211

- **WILLIAM FELZER**
  - Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero
  - 教師 / 丁細
  - 212

- **JULIE C. ANDERSON**
  - Educator/Educatora
  - 教育家
  - 213

- **ROSARIO ANAYA**
  - Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
  - 現任教育委員
  - 214

- **SODONIA WILSON**
  - Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario
  - 負責教育委員 / 大學行政主管
  - 215

- **GREG DAY**
  - Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes
  - 青少年服務主任
  - 216

- **LELAND YEE**
  - Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador
  - 家長 / 教育家
  - 217

- **MICHAEL MOBERG**
  - MBA, CPA
  - 商業管理博士，註冊会计师
  - 218

### (MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董

**Member, Community College Board**

- **ROBERT E. BURTON**
  - Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad
  - 社區大學校董
  - 222

- **ALAN S. WONG**
  - Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
  - 現任社區大學校董
  - 223

- **PAUL WOTMAN**
  - Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante
  - 律師 小商人
  - 224

- **MOY VELASQUEZ**
  - Educator/Educatora
  - 教育家
  - 225

- **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
  - Educator/Educatora
  - 教育家
  - 226

- **JOHN RIORDAN**
  - Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
  - 現任社區大學校董
  - 227

---

**(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)**

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School, Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation, Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $7 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation, Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPUESTAS A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI
LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS GRENE-HUGUES DE 1988 PARA LA COMPRA-AHORRO DE ESCUELAS \n
236 NO
(53)

238 SI
LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1984 PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS ESCUELAS \n
239 NO
(54)

241 SI
LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA LA AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA \n
242 NO
(55)

244 SI
LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR INVERSIONES EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES \n
245 NO
(56)

247 SI
BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACIÓN PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES \n
248 NO
(57)

250 SI
IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES 1 \n
251 NO
(58)

252 SI
ELECCIÓN DEL FISCAL PÚBLICO \n
253 NO
(59)

255 SI
IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIA 2 \n
256 NO
(60)

259 SI
COMPENSACIÓN DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PÚBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS \n
260 NO
(61)
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $300,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,000,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $30, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposiciones a ser sometidas al voto de los electores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Actitud</th>
<th>Detalles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Impuestos locales para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentar los actuales de las tres terceras partes del voto popular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 2</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Propuestas generales y locales de los gobiernos locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Normas y regulaciones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 4</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Propuestas generales y locales de los gobiernos locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 5</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sindrome de déficit adquirido de inmunidad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 6</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sindrome de déficit adquirido de inmunidad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 7</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Restricciones sobre descargas y exposición a sustancias tóxicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bono para mejoras en el sistema de protección contra incendios, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 9</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Deberá construir la Ciudad adicciones al Centro de Conveniones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Rehabilitación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición 10</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

F
Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?

YES 267
NO 288

G
Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290
NO 291

H
Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

I
Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

J
Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M
Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305
NO 306

N
Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308
NO 309

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPOSICIÓN</th>
<th>RESOLUCIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

A 第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

C 第二步
請確認將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

D 第三步
将带针之選票針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

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

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to the polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
VOTER SELECTION CARD
(continued)

Supervisor
(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)

Board of Education
(1)
(2)
(3)

Comm. College Board
(1)
(2)
(3)

BART Board (if any)
(1)

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M
VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td>YES 123 NO 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT. GOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td>YES 126 NO 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARY OF STATE</strong></td>
<td>YES 129 NO 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLLER</strong></td>
<td>YES 132 NO 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREASURER</strong></td>
<td>YES 135 NO 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTORNEY GENERAL</strong></td>
<td>YES 138 NO 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bd. of Equalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>COURT OF APPEAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. SENATE</strong></td>
<td>YES 141 NO 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</strong></td>
<td>YES 144 NO 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE SENATE</strong> (IF ANY)</td>
<td>YES 147 NO 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td>YES 150 NO 151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
**Candidates for Supervisor**

**ANGELA ALIOTO**

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue  
My occupation is Doctor of Law/  
Businesswoman  
My age is 35  
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

*Angela Alioto*

---

**WILLIAM BROWN, JR.**

My address is 2310 Powell Street  
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

*William Brown, Jr.*

---

**RAYMOND COATS**

My address is 419 Garfield Street  
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner  
My age is 37  
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelsie Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

*Raymond Coats*
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chair/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped on Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:


DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:


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

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:


ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:


Thomas Owen Mathews, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired.


Eileen Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. Lily Amunian, 413 Tehama St., Secretary.


Brenda White, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. Christine Mordar, 3524 24th St., Sales Manager. Andrew "Daddy" Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. Dorinda Moreno, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyses standing at the door. Let me in to sup' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militaryization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statement: Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked and have accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
— I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-4th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscoan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984. I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:


Gilman Grant Loate, 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. Rick Paccar, 18 Walter St., Arts Administrator. Roland Quinn, 407 35th Ave., CPA.


NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:


DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
Defend workers' rights against employers.
No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________________________Apt. #________

Address__________________________________________

Telephone No. (required)__________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s):____________________

Second choice locations (if any)____________________

Signature________________________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIOORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committee, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unfinished parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

**ROSARIO ANAYA**
My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and served on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnus, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Ernest "Chuck" Agula, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board.
Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Supervisor.
Babette Dreffe, 721 Kansas St., Self Employed.
Luisa E. Esquerro, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor.
San Francisco.
Lawrence Ferlinghetti Jr., 250 Francisco St., Poet.
Huntston, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer.
Joe Jung, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed.
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor.
John LeSchiavo, 751, 2100 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator.
Bill Malher, 69 Ellis St., Supervisor.
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California.
Peter Meny, 3322 Clay St., Lawyer.
John L. Molina, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Joan Zamora Mouton, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner.
Wendy Nelder, 150 Cazitas Ave., Supervisor.
Pat Norman, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator.
Alfredo M. Rodriguez, 3541 21st St., Administrator.
Gene Royale, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator.
Jean-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President.
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Supervisor.
Alicia Wang, 140 Vulpianino St., Education Specialist.
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

**JULIE C. ANDERSON**
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)
My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTSA and PTSF president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.
Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation, not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:
Thomas Annunziato, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher.
Willie R. Brown, 828 Buchanan St., Retired.
Vera Lee Clanton, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman.
Anne Belle Daley, 795 Geary St., Executive Director.
Ina P. Deerman, 271 Upper Ter., Home Executive.
Libby Deneb, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member.
Robert DeVries, 551 B 29th St., Attorney.
Edgar Flowers Jr., 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff.
Lutos Yee Fong, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer.
Dr. Howard S. Floyd, 55 Noriega St., Pastor.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist.
Leonard Gordon, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director.
Jean Y. Hibino, 732 26th Ave., Secretary.
Jack Jacqua, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide.
Margaret J. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer.
Marge Kaufman, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor.
Dr. Julianne Malveaux, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer.
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/lecturer.
Elena D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director.
Laurie McBrine, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed.
Wayne Moore, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor.
Randall A. Pudgett, 317 Chenery St., Attorney.
Karen Goodson Pierce, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law.
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative.
Gene Royale, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator.
Carole Ruth Silver, 68 Ramsey Ave., Attorney.
Percy Smith, Jr., 1735 7th Ave., Minister.
Mabel Teng, 942 Broadway St., Educator.
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer.
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

**GREG DAY**
My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped fund Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor.
CCSF, Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Harold T. Lee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist.
Doris Woodhouse Kahn, 3239 Clay, Transportation Commissioner.
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent.
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children.
John Francis Rothmann, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant.
Alicia Wang, 40 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist.
Rev. Jean M. Richardson, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister.
Jeff Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council.
Juanita Owens, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator.
Janet Shalwitz, 100 Kensington Way, Physician.
Edward DeLa Cruz, 729 Lake St., Social Worker.
Catherine J. Dodd, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher.
Roderick A. McLoud, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney.
James M. Foster, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant.
Linda Post, 1845 15th St., Marketing Representative.
Donald Dister, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney.
Michael Basten, 1545 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer.
Roberto Estes, 34 Canelli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

**WILLIAM FELZER**

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are falling in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

**MYRA G. KOPF**

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

**GILMAN LOUIE**

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University.
I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teacher aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

**The sponsors for William Felzer are:**
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney.
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. Cecilia B. Hochhawser, 45 Berkeley Way, Service Office. NARFE Ch. 65.

**The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:**

**Gilmour Louie**

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

---

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

---
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MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

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

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or gone through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
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Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption $46,200,000
Bond Interest 38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

The full legal text of Proposition A appears on page 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

No argument was submitted against Proposition A
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Eareman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foss, Chairman, Great Western V.A. Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Gerschwanger, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco’s preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Caldén, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

• Yes on Proposition A.
• Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Phillip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Panetic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption: $140,000,000
- Bond Interest: $145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement: $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibits. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone
for the City’s General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City’s coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers. I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City’s convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry’s needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco’s visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco’s future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It’s a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco’s number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco’s essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can’t compete with other cities’ and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayers depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Ring, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

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

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.
Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here. Vote YES on B!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. A loss of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost San Francisco taxpayers anything. The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri

Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Bath and Jim Gravantis
Tony Kiley
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco’s big hotels. They’ve overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don’t let anyone tell you this isn’t a tax increase just because it’s the hotel tax and not your property tax that’s going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven’t we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hester
Jack Morrison
Alan Razznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOScone CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

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

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which, in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

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

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City? YES 279 | NO 280

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.
(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down. The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding." It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Argumens printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco’s open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco’s children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn’t cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It’s time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter’s Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I’m voting “yes” on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community. The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities. Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D., Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Floyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Ario Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world’s greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco’s children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Kukow
Wilbur Jiggles
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach
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Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children’s bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbato, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebien
Joanne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Soronia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cut-backs, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco’s children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Bruce Rafal, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will

enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Harada
Commissioner Caito T. dela Portilla
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop I3 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynn, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molnari
Louise K. Molnari
William Cohentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Percher Hester
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.
As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city’s children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.
In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition I, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City’s planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.
The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
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Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union #40R
Plasterer’s & Stucco’s Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne

Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Pile Drivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int’l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cyion
Hop Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #804
Hon. Sula Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Carra
Terence Faulkner
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Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.
PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jayke Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive “reciprocal pension benefits” under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocity benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tung, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees’ Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.
Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees’ Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.
**Employee Reps. Retirement**

**PROPOSITION G**

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?  

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

---

**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 should not affect the cost of government.”

**How Supervisors Voted on “G”**

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98**

**APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:**

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concerns of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA
Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donny Stevens
Robert McColls
Wilten Mills
Charles Flinnroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwoyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:
Where do ballot arguments come from? Who writes them? Who pays for them? Why are there so many of them?
Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
PREVAILING WAGES & PAY EQUITY

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?  

YES 293  
NO 294  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase-in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases that the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable. Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaacks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by non-minority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cebatus, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years. The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau
Bob Gonzules
Terry Francois

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Bath Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jose, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margie Kaufman, Former President, Parents’ Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers’ Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Eqg
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women’s League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments.

It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads...“notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor
Police & Fire Pay

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately, this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn’t always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer’s and firefighter’s wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities — yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California’s 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you — our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair. Firefighters and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of “comparable” size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition “I” will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition “I” will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition “I” has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition “I” is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition “I” will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition “I”.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. I passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I
Police & Fire Age Requirements

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments? YES 299 NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: "Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco. The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar’s City Hall office.)
PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302

NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Roca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Patterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaunateur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Beckrize, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Hedinsky, Architect
Ian McKinbbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paul Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teres Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Bergersen Gallery
Ruth Bonstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solet, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstone, President, SF Art Institute
Hoshiro Kudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Pentkowski, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibben White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yonc, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Controller’s Statement on “M”

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

“Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priorities Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or burden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(j) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) “Preexisting office space” means office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Resubmission specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City’s politics and the City’s economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City’s Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced “one-crop” economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen’s initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grasholl
Dennis Amore
Jim Handler
Sue Hastor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park — there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983 — during the last anti-highrise campaigns — the new, so-called “controls” in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 exist-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiel Hammet to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstone, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hazman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Facur, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thellen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn’t true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let’s trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City’s poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-job economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49 cents for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anita Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Mallery
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

• tens of thousands of jobs;
• lower housing costs;
• smaller tax burden;

• better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
• a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco— for greater growth of our city— for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans— for a liveable city— I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco’s Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City’s poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangetland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwansik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Shepard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wasele
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston  
Philip DeAndrade  
Jim Firth  
Ruth Gravanis  
Kayren Hudibburg  
Tom Jones  
Joe Passen  
Ruth Passen  
Regina Sneed  
Lester Zaidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

表决 Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter  
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters  
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter  
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members  
Terence Faulkner  
Robert Silvestri  
Mike Garza  
Tom Spinosa  
Stanley Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.
Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Ariza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenebelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Patrons Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Francisco for Reasonable Growth (SRFG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAR)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:
- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidaata
Angela Alicio
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Purseley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barsh
J. Peter Baumgartner

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heitz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Hoar
Don Hudapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurado
Sally Hoyager
Carl Imparato
Joan Inrator
Agar Jaikiss
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elyean Jones
Buhl and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayzen

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasy
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Susan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise Dione
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Dunekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebein
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamon
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Elia Driscoll
Alvin Duschin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Ennemann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feiser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foke
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Elia Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Bert Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesner
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Arguers:

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Puge
Grace Macduff Parker
Tsh Pearlman
Helen Peer
Robert Pender
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silkman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Storrs
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Swapski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurlston
Ellen Trabley
Marie Utzig
David Wale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Wolkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Bricen Walker
Phylis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warnberg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wetrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single high-rise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal
In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
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rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.
- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**
In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

*Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**
Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

*Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

*Supervisor Wendy Nelder*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.
Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.
Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.
San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.
Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:
• Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
• Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
• Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.
The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naiveté is abundant.
Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little effect on San Francisco in the short run.
Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.
San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas     Michael Bernick
Mark Buell
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.

2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luise Esquivel, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota de Porritt, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $177 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

• Meeting transportation needs
• Expanding the stock of affordable housing

• Developing park and open space areas.
• Meeting earthquake safety requirements
• Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space, citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $177 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Hatano Aiko, President, Aikawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce B. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dedon, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnelly, President, Gesco-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Wilson Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Associates
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jelco, Owner, Jelco Camera Shop
George Martin, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scizzm, Past President, Marin Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Sperry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Suten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Spreul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan Sanz, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kappatos, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemuroski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Pearrxon, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuken, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Wohburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamazaki, Jr., Attorney
Rodrick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hinawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mceny, Attorney
Caryl Meary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Breck, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Phat Lee
Joe Lai, President, Lang Kong Assoc.
Frank Pang, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Lundy F. Eng
Rolland Love M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired
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Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? YES 308 NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Oil Development Moratorium

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.
• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
“CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES” means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HERETINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

 Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting Precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the said special election, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of Precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting Precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

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

Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the “Recreation and Open Space Programs” to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as “high-need neighborhoods”. Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding of the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for:
   (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”, or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes;
   (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and
   (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

   The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

   (e) In each of the first five years of the fund’s existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

   At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current “Recreation and Open Space Program” no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in “high-need neighborhoods” identified in the then current “Recreation and Open Space Programs.”

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service
Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.
The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments
(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of super-
visors as in this section provided and appropri-
atations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fif-
teen thousand dollars per year as provided in sub-
section (b) with respect to members assigned to-
two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons em-
ployed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman pro-
tective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department for heroism or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discre-
tionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant there-
after, such member shall receive the rate of com-
penation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-
wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the

latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certifica-
tion the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-
wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities in-
cluded in the certified report of the civil service commission divided by the number of members in said service. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said cer-
tification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, are as follows:

(1) For the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular ser-
vice in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) For the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commis-
sion for the same class;

(3) For the fourth year of service other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-
age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-
ars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differenti-
als of any type shall be allowed or paid to mem-
bers of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in sections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hose-
men, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire depart-
ment" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of depart-
ment, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritor-
ious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of cap-
tain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of com-
penation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section fail to finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as the index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as herein provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1976-77 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may apply to himself or herself for any appointment under this section, subject to the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorsman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment must become residents within the meaning of Section 5:406 within a reasonable time; not to exceed six months; after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be below 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States:

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitled thereto under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.3201 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman-From List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least two-and-a-half years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to forty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her through-out his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after the death of said member, persons or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order.

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided hereinafter in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary and proper to vest in the right of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department’s certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(b) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department’s list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(d).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 323 is amended as follows:

SECTION 323. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City’s residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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## Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Educator, Educadora</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist. Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics, Profesor de Economia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Governor, State of California Gobernador, Estado de California</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles, Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITE-IN:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor, Vicegobernador</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>College Instructor, Instructor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Author, Autora</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Truck Driver, Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITE-IN:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabajadora (工人)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Law Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Leyes Electorales (選舉法師)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impresora (印刷師)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor del Condado (縣惺議員)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Write-In:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador del Estado de California (加州參議員)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Electrical Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Eléctrico Retirado (退休電工主任)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td>加州議會議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
<td>加州議會議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administradora de Negocios (商業行政主管)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace/Political Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Politico/Pacifista (和平/政治活動份子)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Write-In:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td>Aviator</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Attorney General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECK McKinley</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(WRITE-IN)** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE “TED” ZUUR</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(WRITE-IN)** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF CORINO, Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (Wyatt) Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**General Election November 4, 1986**

**City & County**

**Vote for No More than Five**

**Do not vote for more than five candidates for supervisor**
### Member, Board of Education

**MYRA KOPF**  
President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación  
210

**GILMAN LOUIE**  
Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras  
211

**WILLIAM FELGER**  
Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero  
212

**JULE C. ANDERSON**  
Educator/Educadora  
213

**ROSARIO ANAYA**  
Incumbent/En posición del cargo  
214

**SODONIA WILSON**  
Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario  
215

**GREG DAY**  
Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes  
216

**LELAND YEE**  
Parent/Educator/Padre/Educadora  
217

**MICHAEL MOBERG**  
MBA, CPA  
218

### Member, Community College Board

**ROBERT E. BURTON**  
Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad  
222

**ALAN S. WONG**  
Incumbent/En posición del cargo  
223

**PAUL WOTMAN**  
Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante  
224

**MOY VELASQUEZ**  
Educator/Educadora  
225

**ROBERT SILVESTRI**  
Educator/Educadora  
226

**JOHN RIORIAN**  
Incumbent/En posición del cargo  
227

### Member, Board of Directors BART District

**EUGENE GAFINKLE**  
Incumbent/En posición del cargo  
231

**ARLO SMITH**  
Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito  
232

**TOM SPINOSA**  
Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero  
233

**JAMES PERON**  
Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Políticas  
234
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

### GENERAL ELECTION
**NOVEMBER 4, 1986**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES 235</th>
<th>NO 236</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>YES 238</td>
<td>NO 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>YES 241</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>YES 244</td>
<td>NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>YES 247</td>
<td>NO 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal Impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $7 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>YES 250</td>
<td>NO 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>YES 252</td>
<td>NO 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal Impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>YES 255</td>
<td>NO 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>YES 259</td>
<td>NO 260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS GREEN-LEACH DE 1996 PARA LA COMpra-ARRENDAMIENTO DE INFRASTRUCTURAS ESSENCIALES. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de dos mil millones de dólares (2,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de hospitales en los distritos rurales. La emisión de bonos se realizó en la segunda semana del mes de noviembre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVOS PRESIDIOS. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de cuatro mil millones de dólares (4,000,000,000) para financiar el embarque de presidios en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de cinco mil millones de dólares (5,000,000,000) para financiar el embarque de aguas potables en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de seis mil millones de dólares (6,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas universidades y colegios superiores en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA SALUD. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de siete mil millones de dólares (7,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas clínicas de salud en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA EDUCACIÓN. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de ocho mil millones de dólares (8,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas escuelas en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de nueve mil millones de dólares (9,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de diez mil millones de dólares (10,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de once mil millones de dólares (11,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de doce mil millones de dólares (12,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de trece mil millones de dólares (13,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de quince mil millones de dólares (15,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de dieciséis mil millones de dólares (16,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de dieciseis mil millones de dólares (16,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de diecinueve mil millones de dólares (19,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de veinte mil millones de dólares (20,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 Sí</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de veintidós mil millones de dólares (22,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 No</td>
<td>LEY DE EMISIÓN DE BONOS DE 1996 PARA DAR MÁS SEGURIDAD EN LA INFRAESTRUCTURA. Esta ley permite el embarque de bonos con valor de veinticuatro mil millones de dólares (24,000,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas infraestructuras en los distritos rurales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuance of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td><strong>YES 261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td><strong>YES 263</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td><strong>YES 266</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td><strong>YES 269</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,000,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td><strong>YES 273</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES 276</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES 279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City use at least 42% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES 282</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES 285</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentar los ya existentes, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto para aprobar tales incrementos.

261 SI  62
262 NO  63

IGDIA DEL OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado sufraguen el ingreso al informe oficial del Estado. Permite que el precio del voto local o de los gobiernos locales o estatales.

263 SI  64
264 NO  65

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el personal o el personal de la salud es una condición corregible y sobre la regulación de la formación y de los equipos de atención sanitaria. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta propuesta es estimado de 1 millón de dólares anuales.

266 SI  66
267 NO  67

RESTRICTIONS SOBRE DESAGUAS DE EXPANSION A SUSTANCIAS TÓXICAS. Prohíbe el desagüe de sustancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere informe regular sobre el desagüe. Impacto fiscal: La cantidad total estimada es de 10.000.000 de dólares anuales.

269 SI  68
270 NO  69

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $48,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

273 SI  70
274 NO  71

¿Deberá construir la Ciudad adicionales al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reclutamiento (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

276 SI  72
277 NO  73

¿Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar los bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

279 SI  74
280 NO  75

¿Deberá usar la ciudad por menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreación en las áreas de bienes racionales? Y por menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldías o espacios abiertos?

282 SI  76
283 NO  77

¿Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad, que se jubilaron antes de junio de 1951 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron después de 1951 en una cantidad proporcional? 

285 SI  78
286 NO  79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 287 NO 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 290 NO 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 293 NO 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 296 NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 299 NO 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 302 NO 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposition L was removed from the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 305 NO 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 308 NO 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>END OF BALLOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPONECIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>287 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>288 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias publicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilacion&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>290 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>291 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilacion por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>293 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>294 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minores y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>296 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>297 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de politica y bomberos después de la adopcion de la evaluacion anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>299 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>300 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera eliminar la Ciudad los limites de edad maxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de politica y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilacion en los departamentos de politica y bomberos?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>302 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>303 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>305 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>306 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La proponecion L fue eliminada de la balota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>308 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
<td><strong>309 NO</strong> 反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debera imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petroleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:  如何用自動投票機
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。
YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.  

Not: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra。

USING BOTH HANDS  如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE  在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.  

B 第一步
將雙手捏票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE  如何用自動投票機
STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN  通過自動機
OVER THE TWO RED PINS.  

Paso 2. Asegúrese que los dos  如何用自動投票機
orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta  通過自動機
coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas。

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接
合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT  如何用自動投票機
UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN  通過自動機
THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO  按下選表
INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT  如何用自動投票機
USE PEN OR PENCIL.  通過自動機

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento  如何用自動投票機
de votar y perfore con el la tarjeta de  通過自動機
votar en el lugar de los candidatos de  如何用自動投票機
su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz。

D 第三步
請把穿針之選鳴針由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE  如何用自動投票機
ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.  在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic"
y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLLOT**—An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE**—Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)**—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS**—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS**—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS**—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Candidates for BART Director

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America’s safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART’s farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART’s best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committee member I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don’t work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:
- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kofp
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And underutilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:
- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
## VOTER SELECTION CARD (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm. College Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BART Board (if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
### VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:


WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinari’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:


RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingleside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non-incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:


WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:


DENNIS JOHN GIANATASIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatasio are:

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:


ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer Youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCsf.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:


Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyses standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—a vigorously advocated saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an examination for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987. My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
— I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

NANCY G. WALKER
My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly
- Amos C. Brown, Ill Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board
- Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender
- Shirley Cohelan Burton, 8 Stolt Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization
- Douglas S. Chan, 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney
- Michael A. Chan, 1650 Funston Ave., Planner
- Gordon Chin, 69 Castro St., Executive Director
- Chinatown Resource Center
- Greg Day, 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director
- Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director
- Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
- Wayne Friday, 1095 44th St., Journalist
- Frank S. Fling, 621 Greenwich St., Architect
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff
- Richard D. Hougha, 134 Broderick St., Supervisor
- Carl McHolm, 79 Walter St., Administrator
- Isabel Hulse, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director
- Gordon Juan, M.D., 1838 10th Ave., Physician
- Gilman Grant Louie, 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President
- Rick Pachucar, 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator
- Roland Quan, 407 35th Ave., CPA
- Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Admin. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton
- Arnold G. Townsend, 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant
- Kathleen Owyang Turner, 86 Peralta Ave., Community Activist
- Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent, L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2497 Post St., University Professor
- Sodena M. Wilson, 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education
- Chantale Y.M. Wong, 2714 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer
- Samson W. Wong, 1511 4th Ave., Student
- Harold T. Yes, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly
- Robert F. Berry, 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association
- Miriam Blaustein, 4055 Arny St., Advocate for Seniors
- Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- John L. Burton, 765 Kansas St., Lawyer
- Sala Burton, 8 Stolt Blv., Member of Congress
- Agripino R. Cerbato, 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education
- Angela Coppola, 2018 Bush St., Business Executive
- Carlota Teixidor del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator
- Lee S. Dolson, 1501 Beach St., College Professor
- Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noe St., Supervisor
- Mike Hardeman, 329 Wawona St., Union Official
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
- James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., President, ILWU
- Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
- Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Bruce W. Littlehale, 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission
- Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Agency Director
- John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
- Edward W. Moore, 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur
- Gina Mosecone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
- Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney
- Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Richard Sanchez, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician
- Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Managing Director
- Stephen Tuber, 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood
- Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board
- Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California

DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
- Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
- Sala Burton, 8 Stolt Blv., Representative in Congress
- Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembleman
- Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney
- John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
- Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor
- Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
- Dr. Amos C. Brown, Ill Lunado Wy., Pastor
- VP Community College Board
- Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid St., Consultant
- Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
- Al Borvick, 234 Gates St., Attorney
- John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer
- H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
- Mike Hardeman, 329 Wawona St., Union Official
- Alene C. Hernandez, 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
- Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director
- Rev. Calvin Jones, 39 Esquima Dr., Pastor
- Gordan J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Attorney
- Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Administrator
- Sandra A. Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
- Juanita Owens, 371-A Colderidge St., Educator, Police Commissioner
- Sal Rosselli, 45 Buena St., Union Representative
- Thomatara N. Scott, 1912-14 Broderick St., Program Monitor
- A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillarius Ave., Minister

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

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
  Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win
decent standards and defend rights of
women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
  Human needs before profits! We need
jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care
—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in
Central America.
  Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
  Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
  Defend workers' rights against employers.
  No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops
and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity
against concessions.
  Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No
forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. Nancy
G. Elmore, 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Mem-
ber. Susan L. Englisher, 3456 17th St., Registered
Nurse. Carl Pinkmore, 477 Hickory St., Oil Refin-
ery Operator. Alexandra Figol, 298 Fair Oaks St., Law
Office Assistant. Patricia M. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave.,
Secretary. Suzanne L. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave., Stu-
dent. May Myung, 477 Hickory St., Power Plant
Operator. Millie B. Gonzalez, 60 College Ave., Tutor.
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life
Member. Ruth L. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired.
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk.
Victoria Lindsay, 3795 24th St., Professor. Eiko P.
Mizuhatara, 205 21st Ave., Sales. Esther W. Perry, 3783
20th St., Retired. Hayden H. Perry, 3783 20th St.,
Retired. Joseph Michael Ryan, 1020 Potrero Ave., Ma-
chinist. Ruth E. Schein, One Baker St., Editor.
Michael William Schreiber, 3535 Mission St., Munici-
pal Bus Driver. Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St.,
Muni Driver. Kathryn Setian, 1364 16th Ave., En-
engineer. Lisa Siff, 651 Upland Dr., Student. Christine
Vaught, 1255 Polk St., Clerk. David Walters, 190 Col-
lege Ave., Auxiliary Operator. Brian Webster, 795 8th
Ave., Sales Representative. Nancy F. Wohlfarth, 737
Burnett Ave., Union Representative. Adam Wood, 190
Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this im-
portant work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at
the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there
still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you
will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as
well as others who are interested in community service are
particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will
be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may
mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with
breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please
assign me to a polling place.

Name_________________________Apt. #_____
Address_________________________
Telephone No. (required)_________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s):________
Second choice locations (if any)____________

Signature__________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:


JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see spend most of our money where needed — on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:


ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist lawsuits against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

Moy Velasquez

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Alan S. Wong

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Paul Wotman

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.), Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:


The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:


The sponsors for Greg Day are:


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

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ul-loa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Bataine, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired).
Harry W. Fruechte, 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. Warren R. White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. Ralph G. Hillman, 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired).


Joseph Lewis, 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. Cecillia B. Hochhawser, 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes in the policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:


GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City’s public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:


Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student’s spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students’ ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Jeanette Briscoe, 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education — two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodontia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodontia Wilson are:


LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue!

With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest $38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION A
APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless. Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Kowdon, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Liehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Hauter, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumper will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougal
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteva
Delph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler
Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Myra A. Keef, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbasos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebheim, Member, Board of Education
Jeanine Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tan, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire...the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A...fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Rozanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alice Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Lerry King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezery
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Puterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster — earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.
Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumper's will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.
Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumper's will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

• Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corwin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Rees, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but city-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catas-
trophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

— San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Maeris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Wendglar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

Yes 276
No 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

The Proposal: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A Yes Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A No Vote Means: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption: $140,000,000
- Bond Interest: $145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement: $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths (0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

The Text of Proposition B Appears on Page 46
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco’s most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco’s declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn’t often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco’s competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That’s the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone...
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City’s convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioners to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioners will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry’s needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco’s visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco’s future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It’s a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco’s number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco’s essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can’t compete with other cities’ and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry. Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local, taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect ALL San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayers depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Poul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.
Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.
If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.
Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here. Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.
The convention industry of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.
The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.
The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.
We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.
Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.
The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.
Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.
As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobuchar
Robert Silvestri

Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee
Capitol Campaign Committee
Carole Migden  Lulu Carter
Linda Peet  Arlo Hale Smith
Louise Minnick  Christopher Martin
Sal Rosselli  Ed McGovern
Ron Huberman  Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravina
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C
Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279  NO 280

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down. The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called “refunding”. It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don’t last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A “Yes” vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties? YES 282 NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after-school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Maliniari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cuts to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbede them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Lloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

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

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.
Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.
Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.
The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.
Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.
Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.
Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.
For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.
Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.
Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Diegovan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggetts
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.
Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.
For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.
Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.
Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

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

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D.

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Ceballos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Daneheim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sedonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

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

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman , Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurnado
Commissioner Carla L. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morrow
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinaro
Louise K. Molinaro
William Cohenst
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City. Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.
As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.
In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition I, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285

NO 286

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . . DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

Harry G. Brit
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Jr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Timney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Ji. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT #61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Teresa Faulkner

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie E. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Melinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive “reciprocal pension benefits” under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

The text of Proposition F appears on page 61.

Polls are open from 7:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M.

Note: Your polling place may have changed.
Please refer to mailing label on back cover.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Retirement System.

Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Andal, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon    Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00        Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10        Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30        Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35        Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50        Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55        Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00        Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05        Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20        Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30        Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35        Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50        Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290

NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA
Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donnay Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Finsroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweeteiny

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:
Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries. It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities. Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees’ salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees’ pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact “comparable worth” policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees’ salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That’s why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H’s moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Welfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaacks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Tolles Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mersey
Carol Mersey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Ronario Anaia, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayaia, Member, Community College Board
Yuri Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chia
Al Borvice
Sandy Oeye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years. The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau

Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carolina Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Julio, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Pest, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments.

It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads..."notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter..."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer’s and firefighter’s salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn’t always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer’s and firefighter’s wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California’s 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey. Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year. This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection. Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissions, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That’s why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenheim, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you — our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support.

We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we’ve been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of “comparable” size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition “I” will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition “I” will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition “I” has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition “I” is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition “I” will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition “I”.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>299</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “J”**

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

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

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “J”**

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100**

---

**NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation’s capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #271 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: “This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen.” I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this “off” presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

“Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!”

(EDITOR’S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar’s City Hall office.)
Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person’s taste and judgment ability. Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at least cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco’s art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurateur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockris, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vesely, Architect
Ian McKibbon White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City’s art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Roe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsu moto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nadl, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbon White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
René Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan? YES 305 = NO 306

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;
2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;
3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;
4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;
5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;
6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,
8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(l) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve-month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Freestanding office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(l) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weissberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 2-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City Planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucor, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn’t true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let’s trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Catki Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity. PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Loutie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Canery
Betty Mostaz, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wasser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City’s poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49c for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposal M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martín
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

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

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city —

I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions.

Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina

Jim Morales
Cezio Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villega

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighborhoods
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Francisco-s Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in back rooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan Gordon Chin Alton Chin email Joe Clifford Lee Edwin Lee Deborah Lim

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrisers mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance Council of Community Housing Organizations San Francisco Tenants' Union Tenderloin Housing Clinic Richard Allman Ellen Baughman Hank Barnard
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**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M**

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston  
Phil DeAndrade  
Jim Firth  
Ruth Gravans  
Kayren Hudiburgh  
Tom Jones  
Joe Passen  
Ruth Passen  
Regina Sneed  
Lester Zaidman

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M**

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasantr and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter  
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters  
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter  
Open Space Conservancy

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M**

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Terence Faulkner  
Robert Silvestri  
Mike Garza  
Tom Spinoso  
Stanely Bramwell

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M**

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M**

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
ABSSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Buxton
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lennon
Mike Lighty

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Berman
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. DougEngmann
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Nye Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 35
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
 Nob Hill Neighbors
 North Beach Neighbors
 North Mission Association
 North of Market Planning Coalition
 Open Space Conservancy
 Pacific Heights Residents Association
 Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
 San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
 San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
 San Francisco Humanist Party
 San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
 San Francisco Tenants' Union
 San Francisco Tomorrow (SPT)
 Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
 Sunnyvale-Fulton Neighborhood Association
 Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
 Sunset Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
 Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
 Telegraph Hill Dwellers
 Tenderloin Housing Clinic
 Twin Peaks Council

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

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aiddala
Angela Alito
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Parsley
Buck Bagot
John Bartis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunswasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillokas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denehe
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Estes
Becky Evans
Don Feuer
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Grunader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinatz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurrado
Sally Hayser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intarator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elyane Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorabele Jean Kurtohn
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lundawone
Norman Larson
Polly Leyer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lombard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyme MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Millatzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minkhorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKeeble Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacuraru
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Petri
Robert Pender

Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starback
Peter Stern
Tim Storin
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Swoen
Linda Supinski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor

Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilye
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Venable
Chandler Viker
David Vogel
Daniel Volkman Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brian Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Walker
Sue Warkburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned, but potentially disastrous, tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects — Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

* Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of
rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place
In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Proposition M destroys:
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keefe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betsy Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraud, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little effect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas Michael Bernick
Mark Buell
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:
1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone’s economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.
San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer’s Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int’l. Longshoreman’s & Warehouseman’s Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer’s Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster’s and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.
The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!
Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses” something expressly forbidden under the measure.
Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?
Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.
The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of “sugar coating” will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!
It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City’s workforce.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Esquivel, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlotta del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrisers. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:
- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highriser development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Eonon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs, and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestations, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wins and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnelly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichhbaum, Writer/Restaurauteur
H. Nelson Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scala, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Sperry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staelin, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

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

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco’s public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aydin
Jane Rha Alvizar
H. Jesse Amelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Yoon-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Dannig
Keith Eckman, Administrator
Terry A. Frances, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hornel

Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jerman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Julie, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Stas and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities for Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamashita, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President, Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joanne B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Meece, Attorney
Caryl Meece

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of “neighborhood power” Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Fax Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Pank Bun, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eig
Rolland Love M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can’t improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we’ve got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

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

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.
San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of (continued on page 103)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCREASE BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY SUCH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING SERVICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein described municipal improvements in the amounts, and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges, the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of new pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil. And if to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

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

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Keesey
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by *strike-through* type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renova-
tion Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be ad-
ministered by the recreation and park commis-
sion. Monies therein shall be appropriated, 
transferred, expended, or used as provided herein
for those recreation and open space purposes
determined by the city planning commission to
be consistent with the recreation and open space ele-
ment of the comprehensive plan of the city and
county and in accordance with the “Recreation and
Open Space Programs” to implement the recrea-
tion and open space element approved by the
city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as
from time to time modified by a majority vote of
each of the city planning commission and recrea-
tion and park commission meeting jointly, and
with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

The recreation and open space element of the
comprehensive plan and the “Recreation and
Open Space Programs”, as from time to time
modified, shall continue to identify neighbor-
hoods which are in special need of recreation and
open space facilities, and shall designate such
neighborhoods as “high-need neighborhoods”.

Monies in the open space acquisition and park
renovation fund shall be used to acquire by
purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or
otherwise, real property, interests therein, and
improvement and development rights thereon and
to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands
currently under the jurisdiction on the San Fran-
cisco port commission may be acquired by lease
or otherwise and may be leased and administered
with the funds provided for herein for purposes
consistent with this section. The recreation and
park commission and the San Francisco port
commission are hereby authorized to enter into
contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of
this section. Authorization to expend open
space monies to maintain properties is in-
tended to include funding the operation of
recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to sec-
tion 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of
fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year
1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each
one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to
be utilized for the purposes provided for in this
section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in ad-
dition to, and not in place of, any sums normally
budgeted for the recreation and park commission,
and, together with interest earned thereon, shall
be deposited into the open space acquisition and
park renovation fund. In addition, all grants,
gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for
open space acquisition and park renovation, and
interest earned thereon, unless otherwise re-
stricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Estab-
lishment of this fund is not intended to preclude
any other similar programs or any similar use of
funds by the city and county. All amounts paid
into said fund shall be maintained by the trea-
surer, separate and apart from all other city and
county funds, and shall be secured by his or her
signature and the signature of the fiscal officer.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the
acquisition and development of lands within or
contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”, or
lands on the northern waterfront and bay
shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acqui-
sition and development of properties within the
city and county for open space purposes; and (iii)
the renovation of existing parks and recreation facili-
ties within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to
match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private
funds, grants, or donations given to the city and
county for the purpose of renovating existing
parks and recreational facilities up to an amount
equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of
the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each
year, monies in the fund shall be used without
matching requirement for the purpose of renovat-
ing existing parks and recreational facilities up to
an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the
amount of the monies provided for the fund in that
year. Monies unspent in either category of this
subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be
transferred to the next fiscal year and shall be
used only for the same purposes as they were
originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter
indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund’s
existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of
the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be
used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-
five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies
in the fund shall be used for acquisition of proper-
ties within or contiguous to “high-need neighbor-
hoods”; the balance of the remainder of the
monies in the fund shall be used for administra-
tive expenses and the maintenance and develop-
ment of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the
portion of funds to be used for acquisition as
herein set forth may be modified by the board of
supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years,
if the then-current “Recreation and Open Space
Program” no longer shows any lands appropriate
for open space and recreation purposes, then
the limitation that funds may only be used for
the maintenance and development of properties
ac-
quired from the fund may be modified in whole or
in part by the board of supervisors to provide that
funds may be used to expand the maintenance and
development of other properties held by the recrea-
tion and park department in “high-need neigh-
borhoods” identified in the then current
“Recreation and Open Space Programs”.

(f) The recreation and park commission and the
funds shall remain in the city planning commission
shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such
time receive and review a report from the general
manager of the recreation and park department on
the implementation of the “Recreation and
Open Space Programs”, on expenditures made from
the open space acquisition and park renovation fund,
and on properties developed in the foregoing year
for recreation uses. The general manager of the
recreation and park department shall also make
general recommendations of further lands for ac-
quisition, improvement, or development for ap-
proval by a majority of each of the recreation and
park commission and the city planning commis-
sion meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of
the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open
space fund shall be utilized for open space
acquisition, maintenance, renovation and re-
creation programs on property within the
jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified
School District and the recreation and park
commission including property leased by the
recreation and park commission from private
individuals or public governmental entities.

The recreation and park commission shall al-
locate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on
open space acquisition, development of any
open space properties acquired and developed
pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and
renovation of existing facilities and at least 12
percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of
this section, any funds set aside pursuant to
subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommit-
ted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried
forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to
the statutory and fiscal provisions of the
charter, may be appropriated by the board of
supervisors for any of the purposes enumer-
ated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of
Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired
prior to July 2, 1985

Comencing on July 1, 1987, every retire-
ment allowance payable by the San Francisco
City and County Employees’ Retirement Sys-
tem, to or on account of any person who was
retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of
said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584,
8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby in-
creased by the amount of $50.00 per month,
provided such member had retired prior to
July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after
July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall
be an amount which shall be the same ratio
to $50.00 that the number of years the member
has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retire-
ment system shall count completed fiscal years
between the member’s effective date of retire-
ment and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member re-
ired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member’s retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member’s effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefore shall be based thereon.

The term "costs of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities in 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct.

The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 8.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended and compensation earnable as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be sixteen percent (16%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be one percent (1%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section.

The rate of compensation shall be set at the said percent of the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(i), (2) and (3) and (c)(i), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 250,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finally, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event the said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8,406 of this charter.

(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8,406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided; however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereon to all persons in positions entitled them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of 10 days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320-1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2-Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8,320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would-otherwise be eligible for appointment from List E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of List E-25, Class H2; Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent 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 wife 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth in writing a schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specific period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(7) (9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.3

d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowances for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service right of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exhibition auditorium and whose appointment is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court
decision. This process shall continue until the
Department is able to certify that all projects
with approval dates on or before November 4,
1986 have received permits, have been aban-
don or are no longer subject to litigation
challenging their approval. Notwithstanding
any other provision of the City Planning Code
or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g),
all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of ad-
ditional office space shall be included in the
survey. The list shall not include permits for
projects authorized pursuant to the office de-
velopment competition set out in Subsection
321(b) and Section 322.
(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and
February 1 of each subsequent year as set out
above, the Department shall certify in writing
to the City Planning Commission at a public
hearing the list of all projects enumerated in
subsection (b) above, including the square
footage of each project and the total of all such
projects.
(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the
Department's certification, the Commission shall
reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit esti-
- mated in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000
square feet per approval period until the amount
of square footage remaining on the
Department's list is reduced to zero.
(e) If the City has authorized more than
475,000 square feet as part of the office de-
velopment competition set out in Subsection
321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4,
1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet
shall be separately deducted from otherwise
allowable square feet calculated pursuant to
subsection (d) above for the approval period
and for subsequent approval periods until the
total amount of square footage is reduced to
zero.
Section 321.2 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUC-
TION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to
reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection
322(a)(1).
Section 321.3 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF
EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS
AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT
AGREEMENTS.
Any office development approved pursuant
to a development agreement under Govern-
ment Code Section 65865 or any successor sec-
tion may only be exempted from the annual
limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the
exemption for such office development has
been approved by the voters at a regularly
duly scheduled election.
Section 325 is amended as follows:
SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.
The limit on office development set out in
Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and
324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by
the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in
effect until amended or repealed by the voters
of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.
PART 3—EMPLOYMENT
Be it ordained by the people of the City and
County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II,
of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Plan-
ing Code) is hereby amended as follows:
Section 164(a) is amended as follows:
SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESI-
DENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING
PROGRAM.
(a) The Council has determined in its certifica-
tion of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact
Report, and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and region-
al traffic and transit problems will become
more intolerable as the number of non-resident
employees increases in San Francisco as a re-
sult of new office development. In order to
mitigate those adverse traffic and transit im-

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this
ordinance.
(c) The City and County of San Francisco
may commence an action to enjoin any actual
or threatened use, development or construc-
tion of any crude oil and gas processing and
support facilities in violation of this ordinance.
(d) Any person using, developing or con-
structing any crude oil and gas processing and
support facilities in violation of this ordinance
shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person
convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished
by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars
($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each
use, development or construction of such facil-
ities in violation of this ordinance shall consti-
tute a separate and distinct offense.
Section 5. Planning Commission Study.
(a) The City Planning Commission shall study
the need for permanent and comprehen-
sive controls and shall prepare prohibitory
legislation for the Board of Supervisors to con-
sider before the expiration of this ordinance or
any duly enacted extension.
(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commiss-
ion shall determine the following:
(1) The social, economic and physical im-
 pact of the use, development and construction
of crude oil and gas processing and support
facilities.
(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibi-
tion of the use, development and construction
of crude oil and gas processing and support
facilities.
Section 6. Severability.
If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its
application to any person or circum-
stance is held to be unconstitutional or other-
wise invalid by any court of competent jurisdic-
tion, such invalidity shall not affect
other chapter provisions, and clauses of this
chapter are declared to be severable.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educadora 教育家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor de Economía 经济学教授</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州长</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉矶市市长</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(WRITE-IN)</strong> To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicegobernador 负州长</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大学讲师</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autora 作家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor de Camiones 货车司机</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(WRITE-IN)</strong> To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Worker Trabajadora</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>Printer Impresora</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>Retired Electrical Director Director Eléctrico Retirado</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Organizador Político/Pacifista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director del Comité Patriótico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Organizador Socialista</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU, Republican</td>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congresista Estadounidense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECK McGINLEY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-EN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

# United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Técnico en Electrónica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE “TED” ZUUR</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-EN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator (MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL)</th>
<th>Member of the State Assembly</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td>115 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>117 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF CORINO, Republican</td>
<td>119 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judicial (ELECCIÓN GENERAL) (4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)</th>
<th>Supreme Court Justices</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 123 =&gt; NO 124 =&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 126 =&gt; NO 127 =&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 129 =&gt; NO 130 =&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justices, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall EDWARD A. PANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JAMES B. SCOTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall M. O. SABRAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall HARRY W. LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall DONALD B. KING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ZERNE P. HANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebramos la Vida</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社会主義行動</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 现任市参议员</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista 牙医</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方检察官</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合约程序商務創新服務</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 肥金山公共卫生局衛生服務主任</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista 美術家</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 现任市参议员</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 现任市参议员</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 項立女商入</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR
### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUIE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA, 市場管理師, 資料公開委員会委員</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION)** 教育委員
- **(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD)** 社區大學校董
- 請選最多3人
- Vote por no más de 3
- **Vote for No More than Three**

### Additional Note
- **(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)**
- (No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE- PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposiciones en Elección General de 1986**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 de Noviembre</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62 LOCAL TAXATION.</td>
<td>A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</td>
<td>4 DE NOVEMBRE DE 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</td>
<td>B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>YES 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 274</td>
<td>NO 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</td>
<td>C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>YES 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 267</td>
<td>NO 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</td>
<td>D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 269</td>
<td>YES 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 270</td>
<td>NO 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LOCAL TAXATION.** For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

**OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.** Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

**ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).** Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

**TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.** Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propuestas Estatales**

**Propuestas de la Ciudad y Condado**

**Propuestas de la Ciudad**

- **A** Deberá construir la Ciudad adicciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reclutamiento (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000.
- **B** Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?
- **C** Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldías o espacios abiertos?
- **D** Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $5, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desde entonces en una cantidad proporcional?
- **E** Deberá el 25% de la depósitos de la escuela de la ciudad ser destinados a la escuela de la ciudad en el mismo año fiscal?
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF BALLOT**
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贷成
288 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

290 SI 贷成
291 NO 反对

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

293 SI 贷成
294 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

299 SI 贷成
300 NO 反对

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresen en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

302 SI 贷成
303 NO 反对

¿Deberá extinguir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

La proposición 1 fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贷成
306 NO 反对

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

308 SI 贷成
309 NO 反对

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

FINAL DE LA BALOTA
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

STEP 3

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

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
**YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it doesn’t matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—the election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  * Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
  * mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  * your home address,
  * the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  * then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate (If any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURT OF APPEAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO
My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/
Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.
My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinar’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS
My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jedediah Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.
Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.
With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.
I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:
Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest giveaways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handymen Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisorial campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supa' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:


Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Through-out my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statements are voluntarily checked by the candidates and have not been checked by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
—I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
—I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
—Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouchie fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984. I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of the City.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:


Gordon Chin, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. Chinatown Resource Center. Greg Day, 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. Steven J. Del, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. Wayman Friday, 1095 14th St., Journalist.


Gilman Grant Louie, 577 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. Rick Paccar, 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. Roland Quan, 407 35th Ave., CFA.


NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:


DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public".

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
- Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
- Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
- Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
- Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
- Defend workers' rights against employers.
- No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
- Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________
Address__________________________Apt. #_____
Telephone No. (required)__________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:
- I want to work in the following area(s): _______________
- Second choice locations (if any) ________________________

Signature__________________________
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assessee; Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB; Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner; Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor; Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco; Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly; Attorney; Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress; Shirley Cohan Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization; Lula E. Batmate, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College; Charlotte C. Danforth, 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney; Attorney, Jerald D. DeRyan, 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate; Lee S. Dolsen, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St., College Professor; Adria Garabedian, 191 Delmar St., Community Activist; Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco; Richard D. Honigsto, 104 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF; Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor; Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Attorney; Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster; Bill Maher, 655 Edd St., Supervisor; Carol Migden, 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair; Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF; Louise H. Renne, 9275 Jackson St., City Attorney; Kevin J. Ryan, 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative; Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF; Julie Tung, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College; Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors; Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor; Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is — City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed — on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committee, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committee-man Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor: “Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian.” “City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction.”

“Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station’s unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O’Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari.”

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELEZACEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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**ROSARIO ANAYA**

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence, and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and served on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

**JULE C. ANDERSON**

(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

**GREG DAY**

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

**Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.**
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WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

The sponsors for William Felzer are:
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, Retired.
Harry W. Frustuck, 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco.
Warren R. White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco.
John R. Brady, 1441 53rd Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean.
E. Patricia Lucuy, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney.

WILLIAM FELZER

MYRA G. KOPF
My address is I490 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Libby Denselum, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. Susan Eisenberg, 134 14th Ave., Health Administrator.
James M. Foster, 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff.
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.

GILMAN LOUIE
My address is 1472 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:
Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker.
Velma Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker.
Loretta Hite, 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee.
Dorothy V. Ryan, 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant.
Louie Green, 26 Bridgeway Drive, Housewife.
Dorothy J. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher.
Kenneth L. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist.
Richard Ryley, 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent.
Dorothy Tischer, 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife.
Raul Montalvo, 35 Gaviota Way, Retired-Bank employee.
Harold A. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. Ruth Greenwood, 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber.
Jeanette Briscoe, 666 Harst Ave., Retired Clerk.
Richard W. Shuttleworth, 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman.
Theresa R. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business.
Fred R. Briscoe, 666 Harst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express.
Dorothy F. Bridgeman, 457 Myra Way, Secretary.
Alphred R. Springs, 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service.
Richard A. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel.
Hazel E Hurd, 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk.
Barbara Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife.
Joseph M. Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman.
Robert Barnes, 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager.
Al Borvise, 2134 Gates St., Attorney.
Harry G. Britt, 1592 Page St., Supervisor. Rev. Amos C. Brown, III
Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer.
Sala Burton, 8 Stait Blvd., Representative in Congress. Agrigino R. Ceribos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
Henry Dey, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
Naomi T. Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner.
Grandav A. Jacks-a, 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP.
Frederick E. Jordan, 230 Cuesta Vista Drive.
Civil Engineer.
William O. Kennedy, 200 Duncan St., Supervisor.
Leroy King, 73 Santa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU.
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor.
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director.
John L. Molinar, 30 16 Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Wendy Nelder, 190 Cassita Ave., Supervisor.
Laura H. Renn, 3732 Jackson St., City Attorney.
Jean-Marie Shelley, 859 Burnet Ave., Union President.
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney.
Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Asst. to Rep. Burton. Benjamin Tum, 1777 Jones St., Member, Board of Education.
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.
Nancy A. Walker, 355 Green St., Supervisor.
Elouise Westbrooks, 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarios Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent.
Dr. Amos C. Brown, III
Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board.
Lewis H. Butler, 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor.
James Corey Busch, 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive.
Eileen Caplan, 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist.
Agrigino R. Ceribos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
John Yehal Chin, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal.
Harry J. Chuck, 920 Sacramento St., Presbytery Minister.
Henry Dey, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Steven J. Del, 2121 Larkin St., Attorney.
Isabel Huie, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner.
Johnnie B. Johnson, 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman.
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor.
Ann Blumen Lazars, 65 5th Ave., Businessman.
Peter J. Nardona, 4086 26th St., Administrator.
Gina Penneest, 1234 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant.
Lawrence J. Simi, 358 Uloa St., Parent.
Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Admin. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. Benjamin Tum, 1777 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education.
Marie Tourlos, 515 47th Ave., Union Official.
Ron Wukabashy, 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., UC Professor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarios Ave., Minister.
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian).
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$46,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$38,808,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$85,008,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION A
APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended.

Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter’s Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

— Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amason, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halestead, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

* Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
* Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
* The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.76 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Myra A. Roes, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Gerber, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Daneheim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Ayala, Member, Board of Education
Ernest G. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire...the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A...fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Melton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Toshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Putterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

• Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinoso, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Eneeman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Rees, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthey, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goodwin, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude. Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

• Yes on Proposition A.
• Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.
—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City. Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Terence Faulkner, President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Hendigar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department
Moscone Center Financing

PROPOSITION B
Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?  

YES 276  
NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption $140,000,000
Bond Interest 145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s reputation as “Everybody’s Favorite City” each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco’s convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning — solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously — one of San Francisco’s most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually — a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually — a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco’s declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn’t often agree unanimously — but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco’s competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That’s the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone.
for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hopp Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Provision B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place.

To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The underpinning of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Kloobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa
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Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Leta Carver
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks? B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.
Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONEN CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

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

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 =
NO 280 =

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding." It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

 Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings,

fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282
NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs — keeping open our school recrea

tional facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City — from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D., Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukov
Wilbur Jigges
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilagi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbaito, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeh
Johanne Miller
Benjamin Tam
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco. It's a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children—close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energy of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafid, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carinna T. del Porillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblenz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco’s neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city’s children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 450R
Platerers’ & Shovelers’ Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #21
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne

Harry G. Brit
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int’l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. Californias Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local 804
Hon. Sols Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #2
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504-AFL-CIO
Mike Gara
Teresa Faulkner

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

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to civil or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for every year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ash, President
Paul E. Deering, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

Proposition E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $30 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since Proposition E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

Proposition E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287

NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

The Text of Proposition F Appears on Page 61

Polls are open from 7:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

Note: Your polling place may have changed. Please refer to mailing label on back cover.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new. 8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon  Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions

2:00  Proposition A — Fire Protection Bonds

2:10  Proposition B — Moscone Center Expansion

2:30  Proposition C — Bond Refinancing

2:35  Proposition D — Playground Funding

2:50  Proposition E — Retirement Pay

2:55  Proposition F — Retirement Benefits

3:00  Proposition G — Union-Time Pensions

3:05  Proposition H — Pay Equity

3:20  Proposition I, J — Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits

3:30  Proposition K — Art Curator

3:35  Proposition M — Planning Issues

3:50  Proposition N — Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290
NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
Employee Reps. Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Leverence Martin  
Samuel Walker  
Ray Antonio  
John Hepburn  
William Jung  
Allie Thomas, Jr.  
Bobbie Brown

Donnay Stevens  
Robert McColins  
Wilson Mills  
Charles Flintroy  
Herbert Goodspeed  
Alvin Sweetwayne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

About the Ballot Arguments

Unofficial Matter:

Where do ballot arguments come from? Who writes them? Who pays for them? Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay. Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevaling Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilin-gual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries. It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity. Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative “worth”.

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of “comparable worth” and “pay equity.” I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city jobs classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees’ salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable. Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact “comparable worth” policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees’ salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilenthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees’ salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue. Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee’s work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees’ salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let’s not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees’ salaries. Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Don Horanzy  Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison  Terry Francois
Gordon Lau  
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carla Tejada del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Ruiz, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan Sanjul, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hrosberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Pose, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margie Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Eq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart’s long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads . . . "notwithstanding . . . any provision of any other section of this charter. . . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?
Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities — yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy

Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis H. Giraud, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Giggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
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Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that’s just what we’ve been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of “comparable” size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition “I” will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition “I” will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition “I” has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition “I” is supported by Supervisor John Molinaro, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition “I” will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition “I”.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Good, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I
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Police & Fire Age Requirements

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299

NO 300

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100
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Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history — the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

The Promise Fulfilled

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandson to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: "Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to affect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.)

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)
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Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurateur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedenky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Philip Agee, Artist
Paul Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earl-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kobayat, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McIntyre, Artist
Tom Martoni, Artist
Masahito Matsuno, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305  NO 306

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Controller's Statement on “M”

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

“Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or obstruct our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) “Preexisting office space” shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 350,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called “controls” in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don’t be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buke
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Herschman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucunan, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thielen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods — higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49c for every dollar earned by men — 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women — but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Elsa Saler
Nancy Walter, Supervisor

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

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives — higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;

- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city — I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the

Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar                Jim Morales
Al Borvice                      Celso Ortiz
Marie Acosta Colon             Alfredo Rodriguez
Tony Colon                     Gloria Rodriguez
Mike Garza                      Gene Royale
Robert Gonzalez                Alice Villagomez
Jose Medina

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighborhoods
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighborhoods
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.
But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't. They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned “Heavy Industrial.”

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chau
Gordon Chin
Alton Chin
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Channale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allen
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigade
Robert De Vries
Brian Deuel
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandis Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Mauelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood. Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanias
Kayren Hudibburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeldman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Boston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Landon
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mastroff
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board’s debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engemann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin

Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morton
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Deboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenebelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
 Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Ailada
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Bick Bogot
John Bardsis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunawasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Cassenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Coni
Amy Cooper
Neil Copernini
Zack Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dans
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Demebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driacali
Alvin Durkin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteses
Becky Evans
Don Fessar
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fuglerberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Margaret Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavina Gath
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtsclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Houck

Daniel Humphrey
Harlne Harst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Inrutor
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharen Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elnaye Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Kats
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefling
Henry Kroll
Ira Karlander
S.S. Rash
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lumbrad
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphynne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Holle
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minhorn
Stephanie Mushak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane Mockable Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celia Ortiz
June Ossterburg
Rick Pucar
Dick Puchich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Pext
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Ronsselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riondan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Rosh
William Runge
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shaw
Kevin Shelley
Marth Shires
Jim Schach
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlize Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Sturton
Janet Storm
Jean Strasser
Howard Strasser
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

*Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

*Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

*Supervisor Wendy Nelder*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City’s economic base.
Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco’s neighborhoods.
San Francisco’s neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M’s priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the “existing neighborhood character.”

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.
Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco’s economy.

Our City’s small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

• Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
• Proposition M’s priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
• Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don’t let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilenthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public’s uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and “take San Francisco back from the developers”. If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco’s future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas
Michael Bernick
Mark Buell

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

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.
San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Wallace Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other policies in the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!
Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Laiza Esquerr, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Porrill, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Pete Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $17 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all City residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M’s priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hattory Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Doleman, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Warren Donnelly, President, Genoa-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Pogue Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco’s public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Ria Alviar
H. Jesse Armelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Chi S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuney
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francis, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel

Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jose, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kapriats, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teachers
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Morri, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Ontaño, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Wurtberg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamazaki, Jr., Attorney
Rodrick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Houwusha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Jounie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Meehan, Attorney
Caryl Neary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of “neighborhood power” Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Kayw, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Frank Ring, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Roland Love M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can’t improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we’ve got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammad Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

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

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ☐ NO 309 ☐

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.
• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.
Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electorate of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the revenue of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" to the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

In the event such card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Gerald A. O'Keefe, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Keneally
Deputy City Attorney
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park Renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the “Recreation and Open Space Programs” to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as “high-need neighborhoods”. Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”; or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund’s existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current “Recreation and Open Space Program” no longer shows any lands appropriate, for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in “high-need neighborhoods” identified in the then current “Recreation and Open Space Programs”.

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public hearing annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation use. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member’s effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member’s retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member’s effective date of membership with the retirement system.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.
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8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service and;

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The scales, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) of section 166 of the charter, shall be used as in the previous paragraph, and shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may exempt any member of the department from compensatory or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) Pursuant to the increased of any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsection (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (b), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of consumer indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the county and city at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal years 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants
(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time; not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.
(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 22 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants for H-2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the examination position Class H-2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H-2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of servicerendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his or her 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 after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member’s final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member’s final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(l) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that pres-
ently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of
December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to
appointment in rank order;
(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time
services, where the compensation including the
value of any allowances in addition thereto does
not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per
month. Provided that for each fiscal year follow-
ing fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission
shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150)
maximum for part-time service as provided here-
in, in accordance with the average percentage in-
crease or decrease approved for all classifications
under the provisions of sections 8,400 and 8,401 of
this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be in-
cluded in the annual salary ordinance. Provided
further that such part-time positions shall not be
exempted from being filled from appropriate lists
of civil service eligibles, except upon the recom-
mandation of the appointing officer, who shall set
forth the schedule of operations showing that the
operations involved require the service of em-
ployees for not more than seventy (70) hours per
month and approval of the civil service commis-
sion, including a certification that such part-time
positions cannot practically be filled from exist-
ing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be
used to split or divide any position into two or
more units for the purpose of evading the pro-
visions of this section;
(4) Persons employed in positions outside the
city and county upon construction work being
performed by the city and county when such posi-
tions are exempted from said classified civil ser-
vice by an order of the civil service commission;
(5) Persons employed in positions in any de-
partment for expert professional temporary ser-
VICES, and when such positions are exempted from
said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the
civil service commission;
(6) Entry level positions designated by an
appointing officer with approval of the civil ser-
vices commission for persons who meet minimum
qualifications and are certified as severely dis-
abled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of
this charter, persons appointed to such exempt
positions under this subsection, and whose job
performance is certified as satisfactory by their
appointing officer, and who remain in said ex-
empt position for one year, shall acquire civil ser-
vice status. The civil service commission shall
adopt rules and regulations to enforce and imple-
ment this subsection which shall include perfor-
мance evaluation requirements, definition of and
standards for the certification of the severely
disabled;
(7) Persons employed as curators by any
department of the city and county whose pri-
mary function is the collection or exhibition of
art;
(8) Persons employed as curators by any
department whose primary function is not the
collection or exhibition of art will require cer-
tification of qualification by the Director of the
Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;
(7) (9) Such positions as, by other provisions in
this charter, are specifically exempted from, or
where the appointment is designated as exclusive of,
the civil service provisions of this charter.
The civil service rights, acquired by persons
under the provisions of the charter superseded by
this charter, shall continue under this charter.
Any person holding a salaried office under the
city and county, whether by election or appoint-
ment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or
retain any other salaried office under the govern-
ment of the United States, or of this state, or who
shall hold any other salaried office connected
with the government of the city and county, or
who shall become a member of the legislature,
shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office
held by him under the city and county.
(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies,
departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be sub-
ject to the civil service provisions of this charter
unless specifically exempted.
(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this
charter, the city and county shall perform all acts
necessary to protect the employment rights of em-
ployees of the port authority as specified in Sec-
tion 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.
(d) All positions in buildings and improvements
of the California Academy of Sciences for which
funds shall be furnished by the city and county,
under section 6,404(d) of this charter, shall be
held by employees of the city and county, with the
exception of the director, the secretary of the
board of trustees of said California Academy of
Sciences, the curators and other scientific and
professional personnel, and occupants of part-
time positions for which a total compensa-
tion of less than $80 per month is provided by the
city and county, inclusive of allowance for main-
tenance and other incidental benefits. Positions
held by employees of the city and county at said
buildings and improvements shall be subject to
the civil service provisions of this charter and the
compensation thereof shall be subject to the sal-
ary standardization provisions of this charter, in
like manner and extent in all respects as positions
and compensations of employments in the city
and county service generally, notwithstanding
anything to the contrary contained in the charter
or ordinances of said city and county. The chief
administrative officer shall be the appointing offi-
cer as provided in this charter.
(e) All persons employed in the operating ser-
vices of any public utility hereafter acquired by
lease or under any other temporary arrangement,
under which the city acquires the right to operate
data utility, shall be continued in their respective
positions and shall be deemed appointed to such
positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of
the civil service provisions of this charter for the
period of time during which the city shall con-
tinue to operate said utility under said lease or
other temporary arrangement. Should the city
permanently acquire said utility, said persons
shall come into the permanent employ of the city
and county in their respective positions and shall
be deemed permanently appointed thereto under
the civil service provisions of the charter and
shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all
subject to the provisions contained in sections
8,300(f) and 8,450 of the charter; provided, how-
ever, that said employees who are taken over into
the employ of the city under said lease or other
temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the
residential qualifications of the charter, during the
term of said lease or other temporary arrange-
ment. All employees of any such utility, acquired
or operated by the city under any lease or other
temporary arrangement, who come into the em-
ploy of said utility after the temporary acquisition
of same, shall be subject to the civil service pro-
visions of the charter. The civil service rights of
any person who comes into the service of the city
under any lease or other temporary arrangement
for the acquisition and operation of said utility
shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of
said lease or other temporary arrangement.
(f) All persons employed in the operating ser-
vice of any public utility hereafter acquired by
the city and county, at the time the same is taken
over by the city and county, and who shall have been so
employed for at least one year prior to the date of
such acquisition, shall be continued in their re-
spective positions and shall be deemed appointed
to such positions, under, and entitled to all the
benefits of, the civil service provisions of this
charter.
(g) All employees engaged in public utility
work at the time this charter shall go into effect,
and who have been permanently appointed to
their respective positions in conformity with the
civil service provisions of this charter, shall ex-
scept as otherwise provided by this charter become
employees of the public utilities commission un-
der the classification held by each such employee
at such time.
(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil
service appointee assigned to the airport depart-
ment under the public utilities commission im-
mediately prior to the effective date of this
section, shall be continued without loss in civil
service rights as an appointee of the airport
department, provided that civil service rights as
they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or
lack of funds of all permanent employees of the
public utilities commission, including the airport
department, immediately prior to the effective
date of this section, shall be continued without
loss in the same manner and to the same extent
as though the airport department had not by these
amendments been created a separate city function
under the airports commission.
(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil
service appointee assigned to an exposition audi-
torium and whose job function is placed under the
Convention Facilities Management Department
shall be continued without loss in civil service
rights as though said job functions had not by
amendment to this charter been placed under the
jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer,
and shall not lose those civil service rights which
relate to layoff from a permanent civil service po-
sition in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1). Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City’s residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988, the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sector, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 5,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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## Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>Educadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>College Instructor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Worker Trabajadora</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Election Law Consultant Consultor de Leyes Electorales</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>Printer Impressora</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>California State Senator Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>Retired Electrical Director Director Eléctrico Retirado</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Business Administrator Administradora de Negocios</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace/Political Organizer Organizador Político/Pacifista</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer (TESORERO)</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td>Aviator</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PROCURADOR GENERAL)</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO)</td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the printed instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Senator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDWARD B. &quot;ED&quot; VALLEN,</strong> American Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director del Comité Patriótico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALAN CRANSTON,</strong> Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAUL KANGAS,</strong> Peace and Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED ZSCHAU,</strong> Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresista Estadounidense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRECK McKinley,</strong> Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor Financiero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAMUEL K. GROVE,</strong> Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico en Electrónica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIKE GARZA,</strong> Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR,</strong> Peace and Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabajador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALA BURTON,</strong> Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputada en el Congreso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL)</th>
<th>Estado Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indépendant Businessman  |
Hombre de Negocios Independiente |
105  |
| QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent  |
County Supervisor  |
Supervisor del Condado |
107  |
| LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic  |
Member of the Legislature  |
Miembro de la Legislatura |
109  |

(WRITE-INS) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 111  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the State Assembly</th>
<th>Estado Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
115  |
| WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic  |
Legislator/Lawyer  |
Legisrador/Abogado |
117  |
| JEFF CORINO, Republican  |
Businessman  |
Hombre de Negocios |
119  |

(WRITE-INS) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 121  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Election November 4, 1996</th>
<th>Judicial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT  |
Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD  be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  |
YES 123  |
NO 124  |

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT  |
Shall STANLEY MOSK  be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  |
YES 126  |
NO 127  |

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT  |
Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS  be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?  |
YES 129  |
NO 130  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall <strong>CRUZ REYNOSO</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall <strong>EDWARD A. PANELLI</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall <strong>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>Shall <strong>JOHN W. HOLMDAHL</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td>Shall <strong>WILLIAM A. NEWSOM</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>Shall <strong>JOHN ANTHONY KLINE</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall <strong>ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>Shall <strong>JOHN E. BENSON</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td>Shall</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>JAMES B. SCOTT</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>ROBERT W. MERRILL</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>CARL WEST ANDERSON</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>M. O. SABRAW</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>WILLIAM R. CHANNELL</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>HARRY W. LOW</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>DONALD B. KING</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>ZERNE P. HANING</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## Member, Board of Education

### (Miembro, Junta de Educación) 教育委員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Details</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/President, Consejo de Educación 電腦公司董事</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司董事</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師/工程師</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educatora 教育家</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長/教育家</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA/ 財務管理碩士，註冊公共會計師</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, Community College Board

### (Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad) 社區大學校董

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Details</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, Board of Directors BART District

### (Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART) 灣區快車系統董事

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Details</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任董事</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師/公共交通領導者</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PERON</td>
<td>Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Políticas 政策研究分析員</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Number</td>
<td>Proposition Title</td>
<td>YES 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>YES 261  NO 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>YES 263  NO 264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>YES 266  NO 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>YES 269  NO 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>YES 273  NO 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000?</strong></td>
<td>YES 276  NO 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</strong></td>
<td>YES 279  NO 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</strong></td>
<td>YES 282  NO 283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</strong></td>
<td>YES 285  NO 286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

| 62 | LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities. | YES 261 | NO 262 |
| 63 | OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments. | YES 263 | NO 264 |
| 64 | ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken. | YES 266 | NO 267 |
| 65 | TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected. | YES 269 | NO 270 |

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

**A**
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco. | YES 273 | NO 274 |

**B**
Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000? | YES 276 | NO 277 |

**C**
Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City? | YES 279 | NO 280 |

**D**
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties? | YES 282 | NO 283 |

**E**
Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount? | YES 285 | NO 286 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORCIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPUESTOS LOCALES.</strong> Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentar los impuestos locales y distintos servicios tales como el transporte público, la educación, la seguridad y el cuidado de la salud, se requiere el voto de un número mayor de ciudadanos. Los impuestos pueden ser aplicados sólo después de un período de tres años. La adopción del voto en estos temas debe ser atendida por una mayoría de los votantes en la próxima elección.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SÍGUEMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO.</strong> Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del estado adopten medidas que garantizan el cumplimiento de las leyes federales y estatales. Los impuestos locales no pueden ser recaudados sin el voto del electorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SÍNDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS).</strong> Solicita que se adopten medidas para prevenir el contagio y el contagio de enfermedades infecciosas. Los impuestos locales no pueden ser recaudados sin el voto del electorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTRICTIONS SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPUSIONES A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS.</strong> Prohíbe las descargas de sustancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y el suelo. Los impuestos locales no pueden ser recaudados sin el voto del electorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BONOS PARA MEJORES EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986.</strong> Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejorar el sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la ciudad y Condado de Francisco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBERÁ CONSTRUIR LA CIUDAD ADICIONES AL CENTRO DE CONVENCIÓNS MCCONNELL, A SER FINANCIADAS POR BONOS DE INGRESOS DE ARRENDAMIENTO, A SER EMITIDOS POR LA AGENCIA DE REDEVELOPMENT (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBERÁ LA CIUDAD RECIBIR AUTORIZACIÓN PARA EMITIR NUEVOS BONOS DE INGRESOS SIN EL VOTO DEL ELECCIONADO PARA PAGAR BONOS EXISTENTES A UN COSTO MÁS BAJO PARA LA CIUDAD?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBERÁS LA CIUDAD POR LO MENOS EL 12% DE SUS FONDOS DE TERREROS BALDÍOS PARA PROGRAMAS DE RECREO DESPUÉS DE LAS CLASES DE LAS ESCUELAS, Y POR LO MENOS EL 5% PARA LA COMPRAF Y DESARROLLO DE PROPIEDADES BALDÍOS O ESPACIOS ABIERTOS?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBERÁ AUMENTAR LA CIUDAD LA CANTIDAD MENSUAL ASIGNADA A LOS EMPLEADOS DE LA CIDAD QUE SE JUBILARON ANTES DE JUNIO DE 1961 POR $50, Y AQUELLOS QUE SE JUBILARON DESDE AQUELLA EN UNA CANTIDAD PROPORCIONAL?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong> Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong> Proposition L was removed from the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong> Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF BALLOT**
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贷成
288 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

290 SI 贷成
291 NO 反对

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

293 SI 贷成
294 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

299 SI 贷成
300 NO 反对

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresen en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

302 SI 贷成
303 NO 反对

¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贷成
306 NO 反对

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitidas bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

308 SI 贷成
309 NO 反对

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

FINAL DE LA BALOTA
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

A 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

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

B 第一步
將雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

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

C 第一步
將雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

D 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，按於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

E 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內懸直插上。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

F 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

In the envelope，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. S60 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors have allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:
- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sondolia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. As long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:
- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law / Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough — it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2330 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco — the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinari’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Judedia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.
Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.
Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs: For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.
With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Charles F. Bute, 590 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst.
R.C. Caesar, 150 Topka St., Dentist.
Leroy D. Cagnone, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator.
Doreen Der-McLeod, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. James Fung, 170 Gerrell Dr., Journalist.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.
I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatasio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatasio are:
Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker.
Linda Bartholomeus, 15 A Hayes Ave., Waitress. Carol Arriola Bjerson, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist.
Conception B. Callia, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid.
Virginia Carroll, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. Victoria Castillo, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator.
Julieta C. DeJesus, 1999 Silver Ave., Staff Associate.
Ramón Michelle, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. James Muscat, Jr., 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. Barbara Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. Vernon M. Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter.

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

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handymen Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF. Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyses standing at the door. Let me in to sup' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall’s ‘Private Club’ mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.
As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Candidates for Supervisor

**PAT NORMAN**

My address is 319 Richland Avenue  
My occupation is Program Administrator  
My age is 46  
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities.  
I make San Francisco work for everyone.  
—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.  
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.  
—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.  
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:  
—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.  
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.  
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:  

**A.D. (WYATT) NORTON**

My address is 676-47th Avenue  
My occupation is Artist  
My age is 28  
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebearer on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:  

**JANET SHIRLEY**

My address is 573 Alvarado Street  
My occupation is Businesswoman  
My age is 35  

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:  

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.
As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco’s population and the future of San Francisco.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I’ve enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I’ve worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I’ve helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I’ve helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I’ll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.
Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been “Open to the Public”.

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60

My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win
decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care
—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters’ income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers’ rights against employers.
No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity
against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Mem-
ber. Susan L. Englander, 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. Carl Finamore, 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery
Operator. Alexandra Folger, 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. Patricia M. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave.,
Secretary. Suzanne L. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave., Stu-
dent. May May Gong, 477 Hickory St., Power Plant
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life
Member. Ruth L. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired.
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk.
Victoria Lindsay, 3795 24th St., Professor. Ilko P.
Mizuhara, 205 21st Ave., Sales. Esther W. Perry, 3783
20th St., Retired. Hayden H. Perry, 3783 20th St.,
Retired. Joseph Michael Ryan, 2020 Potrero Ave., Ma-
chinist. Ruth E. Schelin, One Baker St., Editor.
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Munici-
pal Bus Driver. Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St.,
Muni Driver. Kathryn Setian, 1364 6th Ave., En-
gineer. Lisa Siffer, 651 Upland Dr., Student. Christine
Vaugha, 1255 Polk St., Clerk. David Walters, 190 Col-
lege Ave., Auxiliary Operator. Brian Webster, 795 8th
Ave., Sales Representative. Nancy F. Wohlfith, 737
Burnett Ave., Union Representative. Adam Wood, 190
Parnassus Ave., Musician.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Fran-
cisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this im-
portant work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at
the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there
still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you
will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of
polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as
well as others who are interested in community service are
particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will
be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may
mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with
breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please
assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________Apt. #____

Address__________________________Telephone No. (required)__________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________

Second choice locations (if any)__________________________

Signature__________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON
My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

JOHN RIORDAN
My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI
My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committee, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committee member Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BARt director Eugene Garfinke has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinke voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinke was denounced on KRQN-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinke joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Moliniari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellence education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Velasquez are:


ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For The Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:


PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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**ROSAARIO ANAYA**

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and served on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

**JULE C. ANDERSON**

(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

**GREG DAY**

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committeee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

---

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemanbyman.

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are failing in school, so — Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

MYRA G. KOPF
My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleges elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

GILMAN LOUIE
My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City’s public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student’s spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students’ ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:
Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher/homesemaker.
Velma Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker.
Frederick W. Walters, 306-A Pine St., Electronic Tech.
Loreta Hite, 362 Los Palmas Dr., Retired City Employee.
Dorothy V. Ryan, 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant.
Louis Green, 26 Bridgeway Drive, Housewife.
Dorothy J. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher.
Kenneth L. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist.
Richard Riley, 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent.
Dorothy Tischer, 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife.
Raul Montalvo, 35 Gaviota Way, Retired Bank Employee.
Harold A. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner.
Ruth Greenwood, 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber.
Jeanette Briscoe, 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk.
Richard W. Shuttleworth, 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman.
Theresa R. Cantor, 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business.
Fred R. Briscoe, 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express.
Harrill Montalvo, 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee.
Dorothy F. Bridgeman, 457 Myra Way, Secretary.
Alphred R. Springs, 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician.
Richard A. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Member of the Gospel.
Hazel E. Hurd, 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk.
Barbara Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife.
Joseph M. Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman.
Robert Barnes, 28 Fiorentina St., Personnel Manager.
Al Bovrice, 224 Gates St., Attorney.
Harry G. Britt, 1392 Pag St., Supervisor.
Rev. Amos C. Brown, Ill
Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board.
Wille Lewis Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer.
Sara Burton, 8 Stow Blvd., Representative in Congress.
Agrinio R. Cerbatis, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
Naomi T. Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner.
Grandval A. Jackson, 257 Kingston Way, Pres. NAACP.
Frederick E. Jordan, 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer.
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor.
Leroy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Reg. Director.
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor.
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director.
John J. Molinari, 2406 15th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor.
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Union President.
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney.
Benjamin Tom, 1777 Jones St., Member, Board of Education.
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.
Arrandil Walker, 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor.
Doris M. Wurd, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Supervisor.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitarias Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1449 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue. With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent.
Rev. Amos C. Brown, Ill Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board.
Lewis H. Butler, 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor.
James Corey Busch, 205 Buchanan St., Sports Executive.
Eileen Caplan, 1599 26th Ave., Community Activist.
Agrinio R. Cerbatis, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
John Tehall Chinn, 304 Lyon St., School Principal.
Harry J. Chuck, 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Steven J. Doli, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
Isabel Hui, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner.
Johnnie B. Johnson, 10 Quicksip Lane, Businesswoman.
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor.
Ann Blumein Lazurus, 65 5th Ave., Businessman.
Rev. James Leach, 195 Borica Way, Minister.
Jeffery Ken Mori, 360 Peshaw Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council.
Peter J. Nardone, 4086 26th St., Administrator.
Gina Pannestri, 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant.
Lawrence J. Simi, 358 Ulloa St., Parent.
Benjamin Tom, 1777 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education.
Marie Tourelos, 515 4th Ave., Union Official.
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.
Ron Wakuayashiki, 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League.
Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., UC Professor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitarias Ave., Minister.
Hannah A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clegy (Presbyterian).
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273  ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest $38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumping stations can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry G. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Charles McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howard, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litichiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumper will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman W. Wechsler

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

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Brontkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed E. Patterson

Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We ask the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

J. M. Eneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter’s Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco’s preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.
  —San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:

Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Dean Morris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION B
Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?  

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption $140,000,000
- Bond Interest 145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as “Everybody's Favorite City” each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Pls, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone.
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffer. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America’s convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco’s economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City’s most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let’s protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let’s vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco’s worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don’t expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation’s convention industry.

There’s a lot at stake for San Francisco’s future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxing families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city’s economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor’s Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

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

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.
Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.
If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.
Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.
Vote YES on B!

William F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.
The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.
Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.
The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.
The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.
The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.
We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.
Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.
The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.
Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.
As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri

Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosi
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosellini
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureha Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Rush and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout. This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine. And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing. Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Ranzick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONEN CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

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

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279  NO 280

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C
APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called “refunding”. It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don’t last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A “Yes” vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:
(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

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

**PROPOSITION D**

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

---

**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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “D”**

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97**

**NOTE:** YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.

PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:
• It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
• It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
• It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
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Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community. The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil. With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Floyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world’s greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco’s children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco’s children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kapf, President
A. Richard Cerbates, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
Joanne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children—close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafid, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children — and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinaro
Louise K. Molinaro
William Coblenz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that have been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
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Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount? YES 285 NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assocs.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Bevels Clayton
Hod Carriers Local 16
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faubelner

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Pers Dime Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Conat. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterers & Shephard's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Remme
Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it. Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Dritscol, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy. The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F
Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocity benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employ-

ment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

VOTE YES on Proposition F

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Ario Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees’ Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees’ Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00 Proposition A — Fire Protection Bonds
2:10 Proposition B — Moscone Center Expansion
2:30 Proposition C — Bond Refinancing
2:35 Proposition D — Playground Funding
2:50 Proposition E — Retirement Pay
2:55 Proposition F — Retirement Benefits
3:00 Proposition G — Union-Time Pensions
3:05 Proposition H — Pay Equity
3:20 Proposition I, J — Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30 Proposition K — Art Curator
3:35 Proposition M — Planning Issues
3:50 Proposition N — Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290
NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:
It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donray Swens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwone

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. 
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on

women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That’s why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outdated attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H’s moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Millon Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees’ salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau

Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Bath Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Tesor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women’s Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margot Kaufman, Former President, Parents’ Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers’ Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women’s League
Judith Katz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart’s long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments.

It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads...“notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296

NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
POLICE & FIRE PAY

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your 'Yes' vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy

Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That’s why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

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

It’s not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that’s just what we’ve been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of “comparable” size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition “I” will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition “I” will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition “I” has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition “I” is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition “I” will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition “I”.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the role as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299

NO 300

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths.

She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)
Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person’s taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paerison, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitrii Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City’s art collections.

Phoebe Aage, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresa Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Bergruen Gallery
Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earles-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;
2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;
3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;
4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;
5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;
6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,
8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65965 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65965 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(l) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(1) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(2) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

2. Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) “Preexisting office space” shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not necessary to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(l) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit. 1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Jim Morales
Dennis Antenore
Jack Morrison
Jim Handler
Pat Norman
Sue Hestor
Alan Raznick
Geraldine Johnson
Calvin Welch
Michael Lighty
Susan Weisberg
Esther Marks
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-5 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kalin, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Herschman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacuraj, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thelen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. VOTE YES ON M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Deerman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Esola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cali Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods — higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betsy Mosier, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Renne, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wasser, Towne Tub Laundromat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men — 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women — but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrisers.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the

Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Organizations listed for identification only
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar  
Al Borvicer  
Marie Acosta Colon  
Tony Colon  
Mike Garza  
Robert Gonzalez  
Jose Medina

Jim Morales  
Celso Ortiz  
Alfredo Rodriguez  
Gloria Rodriguez  
Gene Royale  
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods  
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association  
Anza Vista Improvement Club  
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association  
Cow Hollow Improvement Association  
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association  
District One Political Action (Richmond District)  
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association  
Friends of Noe Valley  
Glen Park Association  
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)  
 Nob Hill Neighbors  
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association  
North Beach Neighbors  
North Mission Association  
Pacific Heights Residents Association  
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)  
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association  
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)  
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)  
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association  
Telegraph Hill Dwellers  
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hester

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangetown site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prower
Alicia Wang
Chansale Wong
Leslie See

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigade
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Warelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston  
Phil DeAndrade  
Jim Firth  
Ruth Gravanis  
Kayren Hudiburgh  
Tom Jones  
Joe Passen  
Ruth Passen  
Regina Sneed  
Lester Zeldman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter  
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters  
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter  
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members  
Terence Faulkner  
Robert Silvestri  
Mike Garza  
Tom Spinosa  
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baxton
Gordon Chin
Jim Ellis
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Puisis
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technician Local 13
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Patrons Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Responsible Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sunset-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggel
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alloto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgarner

Helen Bean
Non & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunswasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casanova

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Maries Cleasby
Elaine Conte
Amy Cooper
Neil Capernini
Zach Covan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
K. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Donebein
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberting
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engemann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Reeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Friend
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavo Gash
Gabriel Geman
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We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeanette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Mau Holloway
John Holtclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Hartline Hurst
Jerry Hurrado
Sally Huysen
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Iskiw
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Keysen

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilrey
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klgerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Karl Korium
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurniander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Langanbrown
Norman Larson
Polly Laver
Beatrice Levine
Peter Lenzenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lombard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphine MacDonald
Pamela and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Non McInerney
Will McKay
John Meiring
Aline Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minhorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Malinak
Jack Moore

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

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. This would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the city in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
Planning Initiative

run down store fronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**
In San Francisco, we’ve fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

*Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent than is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That’s why I’m voting against Proposition M. It’s bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

*Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco’s existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco’s neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City’s neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

*Supervisor Wendy Nelder*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The “no new housing”, “no growth”, “no jobs”, “no construction” lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year “freeze” of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

*W.F. O’Keefe Sr., President*
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Berman, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from cutting costs by dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little effect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas Michael Bernick
Mark Buell
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco—working people. San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a citywide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.

2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and porno- graphic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character.”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedence over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions and therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The Master Plan’s employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities! Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M drastically reduces job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available spaces, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses”—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employers commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION P

If Proposition P passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition P will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition P will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition P.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION P

Proposition P pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunties to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

• Meeting transportation needs
• Expanding the stock of affordable housing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The underdeveloped clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Re: James Louch, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Zion Baptist Church
Dr. Hannah Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Modear, Pastor
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.

2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedence over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses” — something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone’s economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer’s Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int’l. Longshoremen’s & Warehousemen’s Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer’s Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster’s and Shop Hands Local #66

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City’s needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan’s innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won’t meet the future needs of all our citizens.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

• Meeting transportation needs
• Expanding the stock of affordable housing.

• Developing park and open space areas.
• Meeting earthquake safety requirements
• Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M’s priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance

Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church

Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President

Interdenominational Ministers Alliance

Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor

Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco’s economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M’s priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don’t let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It’s another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M’s extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City’s General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant’s Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnelly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter J. Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scala, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Stain, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sprawl, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnette, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederick Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Caneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Deming
Keith Dickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gilham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Joe Orite-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Petersen, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Rodrick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hravatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Esort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezy, Attorney
Caryl Mezy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Frank Pung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Lundy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Muhammad Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

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

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308

NO 309

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Melinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

* Yes on Proposition N.
* Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life, fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

“CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES” means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
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CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCREASE BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATES OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, properties and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000.

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 5. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials;" and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Kenealy
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in need of special needs of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereof shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts and bequests paid into the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county. Each fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remaining monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund. At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the precinct graph, when agreed by the member organization.

The retirement board shall have authority to establish procedures for compensation and collect contributions for representative service and the calculation of compensation herein used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's allowance.

This section shall be effective November 1, 1986. This section shall not apply to members or their successors who retired or terminated prior to such date.

8.517 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

This section shall be effective prior to a representative service credit to be effective date of membership with the system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-4 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make pay equity adjustments to the base recommended by the civil service pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407 that said adjustments shall not exceed the equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required by this section and provided further that adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of Article XIII B, Section 2.503.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the survey, the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(i) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third years for police officers, police patrol officers and women protective officers shall be in accordance with the general percent ial between seniority steps found ranges included in the certified report of the civil service commission for the same classification.

(3) for said members of the police other than police officers, police patrol officers and women protective officers shall be the same percent of adjustment as that contained in said ordinance for police officers for said year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount fractional amount which may result from said adjustment specified in said ordinance being taken to the next higher dollar.

The rates of compensation set
Oil Development Moratorium

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise R. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.
• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanage- ment: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new. Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) Offshore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, bullheading, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
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ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID FRANCISCO. REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PREscribing NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

BE IT ORDAINED, BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000, to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, §46,200,000;
That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Keneally
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park Renovation Fund
(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods." Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the northern waterfront and bayshoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (c).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund. At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after-school recreation programs.

Notes:
- This section is new.
- 8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for remittance of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions, the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member’s retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member’s effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid to police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of sup-
ervisors as in this section provided and appropri-
ations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of
the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of
1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen
dollars ($15) per month now provided in sub-
section (b) with respect to members assigned to
two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section
8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons em-
ployed in the police departments of said cities of
350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially
the duties being performed on the effective date
of this section by police officers, police patrol
drivers and women protective officers in the San
Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer to become entitled to retired
pay or police patrol driver to receive the annual compen-
sation as provided for herein, service rendered prior
to the effective date of this amendment shall be
given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman pro-
tective officer or police patrol driver on military
leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the
city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation
as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the
department for heroic or meritorious conduct.
The form or amount of said reward is to be discre-
tionary with the commission, but not to exceed
one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as
an assistant inspector is not at the time of the
appointment, or is appointed a sergeant there-
fter, such member shall receive the rate of com-
ensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each
year the civil service commission shall survey,
and certify to the board of supervisors, additional
rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-
wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police
departments of all cities of 350,000 population or
over in the State of California, based upon the
latest decennial census. For the purpose of the
civil service commission's survey and certifica-
tion the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle
duty shall include the average additional amount
paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle
duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have
the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to
fix the additional rate of pay for the members of
the force assigned who are assigned two-
wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay
will be determined by the average additional wage
paid to members in regular service in the cities in-
cluded in the certified report of the civil service
commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this
paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional
rates of pay certified by the civil service commis-
sion divided by the number of cities in said cer-
tification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of
said annual compensations and shall be effective
from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of
compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be
less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each
year, the civil service commission shall survey and
certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the
respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000
population or over in the State of California,
based upon the latest federal decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission's
survey and certification the rates contained in
said certification shall be the average of the maxi-
num rates paid to each firefighter classification
performing the same or essentially the same
duties as firefighters in the City and County of
San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have
the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance,
to fix rates of compensation for the members of the
fire department whose annual compensations are
not set forth in subsection (a) or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from
the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said
ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter
the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate
which is the average of the maximum compensa-
tion paid firefighter classifications in regular ser-
vice in the cities included in the certified report of
the civil service commission. "Average wage" as
used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the
maximum averages certified by the civil service
commission divided by the number of Firefighter
classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service
for firefighters shall be established in accordance
with the general percentage differential between
seniority, as found in the salary ranges included
in the cities certified by the civil service commis-
sion for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department
other than firefighters shall include the same
percent of adjustment as that established by said
ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of
service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the
fractional amount which may result from percent-
age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-
ars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is
hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of
wages, with included range scales, and does not
include such working benefits as might be set up
by any other city by way of holidays, vacations,
other permitted absences for any type whatsoever,
overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or
other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing
other than a basic amount of wages, with included
range scales, is to be included within the meaning
of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to mem-
bers of the fire department referred to herein only
as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the
expression "rates of compensation", as used in sub-
sections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section
169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "com-
pen sation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section
shall mean as hereinafter provided, in the fire
departments of said cities of 350,000 population
or over or of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco, to perform substantially the duties being
performed on the effective date of this section by
drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or horse-
men, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire depart-
ment" does not include members of the fire
commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the
fire department on military leave of absence,
when defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall
be reckoned a part of such member's service under
the city and county, for the purpose of computing
years of service in gaining added compensation
as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of depart-
ment, the commission may reward any officer or
member of the department for heroic or meritori-
ous conduct, the form or amount of said award to
be discretionary with the fire commission, but
not to exceed one month's salary in any one
instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of cap-
tain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety,
and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall
be thirteen percent (13 %) above the compensation
established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant
as provided for in this section. The rates of com-
pen sation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire
prevention and public safety, and investigator, bu-
reau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent
(10 %) above the compensation established for
the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this
section. The rate of compensation shall be set at
the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount
which may result from percentage adjustment
specified in this subsection, half dollars being
taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to
the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and
the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the
provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the
same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(i) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(ii) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(j) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of Section 8.406 of this charter.

Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of Section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to future rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal years 1986-87.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION J**

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time; not to exceed six months; after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them to the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the police entrance class H-2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.558-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.558-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.558-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment of them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.558-1 plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, for
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the com-

8.558-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.558-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment of them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.558-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent 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 wife 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 8.558-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the com-

pensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(i) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order; (3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section; (4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission; (5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission; (6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled; (7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art; (8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; (9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter. The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of this or any other temporary arrangement, if suspended by this charter, shall continue under this charter. Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county. (b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted. (c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1335. (d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall appoint the chief administrative officer as provided in this charter. (e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement. (f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, and at the time the same is taken over by the city and county shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter. (g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time. (h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission. (i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(e) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(f) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.
(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.
If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other parts or clauses of this chapter or the validity of this chapter or the validity of this chapter or the severability of any other provisions and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)
In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLL WORKERS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;yes&quot; or &quot;no&quot; on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**GOBERNADOR**

**Governor**

- **MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ,** Peace and Freedom
  - Educator
  - Educadora

- **GARY V. MILLER,** American Independent
  - Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
  - Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC

- **JOSEPH FUHRIG,** Libertarian
  - Professor of Economics
  - Profesor de Economía

- **GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN,** Republican
  - Governor, State of California
  - Gobernador, Estado de California

- **TOM BRADLEY,** Democratic
  - Mayor, City of Los Angeles
  - Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles

**WRITE-IN**

To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

---

**VICEGOBERNADOR**

**Lieutenant Governor**

- **LEO T. McCARTHY,** Democratic
  - Lieutenant Governor
  - Vicegobernador

- **MIKE CURB,** Republican

- **CLYDE KUHN,** Peace and Freedom
  - College Instructor
  - Instructor de Colegio Universitario

- **NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR,** Libertarian
  - Author
  - Autora

- **JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN,** American Independent
  - Truck Driver
  - Conductor de Camiones

**WRITE-IN**

To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabajadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Law Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Leyes Electorales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impresora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Electrical Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Eléctrico Retirado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administradora de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace/Political Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Político/Pacifista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer (TESORERO)</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td>Aviador</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PROCURADOR GENERAL)</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>Attorney, California</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGPALAMIENTO)</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. “ED” VALLEN</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECK MCKINLEY</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE “TED” ZUUR</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL)</td>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY, Republican</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios Independiente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Legislatura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislator/Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF CORINO, Republican</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Chief Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Shall <strong>ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 123, NO 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Shall <strong>STANLEY MOSK</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 126, NO 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Shall <strong>MALCOLM M. LUCAS</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 129, NO 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justices, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>Cruz Reynoso</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>Edward A. Panelli</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>Joseph R. Grodin</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division One</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>John W. Holmdahl</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division One</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>William A. Newsom</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Presiding Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Two</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>John Anthony Kline</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Two</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>Allison Martin &quot;Al&quot; Rouse</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Associate Justice Court of Appeal First Appellate District Division Two</strong></td>
<td>Shall <strong>John E. Benson</strong> be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>JAMES B. SCOTT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>ROBERT W. MERRILL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>CARL WEST ANDERSON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>M. O. SABRAW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>WILLIAM R. CHANNELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>HARRY W. LOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>DONALD B. KING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall <strong>ZERNE P. HANING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Member, Board of Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party/Position Details</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 在生活党</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市参议员</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY” JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología 警察学学生</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超级地毯清洗公司老板</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法律博士／女商人</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSHEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社会主義行动家</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市参议员</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 现任市参议员</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista 牙医</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方检察官</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合同程序及创意办公室服务</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 金山县公共卫生局卫生服务主任</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista 艺术家</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 现任市参议员</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小企业及邻里倡导者</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 现任市参议员</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 自立女商人</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 1986**

**DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR**

(WRITE-INS) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Member, Board of Education

**MYRA KOPP**  
President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación

**GILMAN LOUIE**  
Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras

**WILLIAM FEZIER**  
Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero

**JULIE C. ANDERSON**  
Educator/Educadora

**ROSARIO ANAYA**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo

**SODONIA WILSON**  
Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario

**GREG DAY**  
Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes

**LELAND YEE**  
Parent/Educator/Padre/Educadora

**MICHAEL MOBERG**  
MBA, CPA/Graduado de Maestría, Contador Público

---

### Member, Community College Board

**ROBERT E. BURTON**  
Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad

**ALAN S. WONG**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo

**PAUL WOTMAN**  
Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante

**MOY VELEZ**  
Educator/Educadora

**ROBERT SILVESTRI**  
Educator/Educador

**JOHN RIORDAN**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo

---

**(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)**

*(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 100 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贷成
236 NO 反对

LEY DE EMBIÓS DE BONOS GREEN-HUGHS OF 1986 PARA LA COMpra-AÑADIDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permitirá el préstamo de bonos con una suma de cantidades míniomas de dólares ($500,000,000) en el año.

238 SI 贷成
239 NO 反对

LEY DE EMBIÓS DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRESESES. Esta ley permitirá el préstamo de bonos con una suma de cantidades míniomas de dólares ($150,000,000) para financiar nuevas escuelas y en el año.

241 SI 贷成
242 NO 反对

LEY DE EMBIÓS DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permitirá el préstamo de bonos con una suma de cantidades míniomas de dólares ($500,000,000) para mejorar la calidad del agua potable.

244 SI 贷成
245 NO 反对

LEY DE EMBIÓS DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR REHABILITACIONES EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permitirá el préstamo de bonos con una suma de cantidades míniomas de dólares ($500,000,000) para financiar la rehabilitación de instalaciones en las universidades y otros colegios superiores de California.

247 SI 贷成
248 NO 反对

BENEFICIOS DE JURISDICCIÓN PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Permite que los funcionarios constitucionales tengan los mismos beneficios fiscales que los principales del estado. Esta propuesta está en votación.

250 SI 贷成
251 NO 反对

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Esta ley establece un impuesto sobre las transferencias de bienes de uno a otro para aquellos que superan un cierto umbral, con el objetivo de recaudar fondos para la educación.

252 SI 贷成
253 NO 反对

ELECCIÓN DEL FISCAL PÚBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea elegido por el pueblo. Esta propuesta está en votación.

255 SI 贷成
256 NO 反对

IMPOSIBILIDADES SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIA. Esta ley establece que las propiedades residenciales no pueden ser vendidas o cambiadas de residencia.

259 SI 贷成
260 NO 反对

COMPARACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la comparación de salarios entre funcionarios, empleados públicos y contratistas.

(TERMINACIÓN DE VOTACIÓN DE 1986)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 262</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 263</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 264</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 266</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 267</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 269</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 273</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 274</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 276</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 277</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 280</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 282</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 283</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 285</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO 286</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

#### PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986

Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESTRICCIONES DURANTE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS

Pueden ser dispuestas de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere abolición de la exposición a sustancias químicas tóxicas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONTRATACIONES MECONE, 1986

Para emitir contratos de $400,000 para remodelación y mejoras.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ¿Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Conven- ciones Mecone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reestructuración (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ¿Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ¿Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de torres para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades bállides o espacios abiertos?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>No Aprobación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevas edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**
**STEP 1**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

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

Notas: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

**STEP 2**

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

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

**STEP 3**

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

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

**STEP 4**

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

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

**STEP 5**

B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

D 第三步

請把選票之選舉針由小孔內票直插入

打孔投票。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by 
October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a 
form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political 
party you consider yours you can check the box on the form 
saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn’t 
matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of an-
other political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any 
candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary 
election, you can only choose among the candidates of your 
party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Con-
troller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of 
Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State 
Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and mem-
ers of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. 
Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal 
will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

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

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is 
there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t 
help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling 
place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've 
written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and 
will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know 
how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will 
have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on 
election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actu-
ally need it and wouldn’t otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that 
you inform your employer at least three working days in 
advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on elec-
tion day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and 
voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook 
(see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or 
postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard 
should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Fran-
cisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name 
underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of 
Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of 
Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee 
ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, 
November 4, 1986.
VOTER SELECTION CARD
(continued)

Circuit the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

### CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinari’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the Oceanview, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore Oceanview Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Consultant
Consulting Company

My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson.
Susan Brady Alfaro, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer.
David D. Ardoin, 699 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor.
Robert B. Bacca, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney.
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Developer.
Jack Casford, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant.
Frances A. Condon, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife.
Kathleen Cormier, 321 Richland Ave., Writer.
Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St., Professor.
Belle Falk, 1000 Green St., Investor.
Rick Hauptman, 1995 Noe St., Computer Manager.
Robert L. Hogan, 397 Clay St., Consultant.
Jennifer C. Houston, 22 Delgado St., Consultant.
Henrietta Odell Humphreys, 340 Clay St., Financial Advisor.
Walter G. Jaffe, 340 Polaris Wy., Businessman.
Richard N. Lerner, 67 Wawona St., Consultant.
Leroy Looper, 827 Guerrero St., Director.
Richard William Lowny, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant.
John J. Noonan, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver.
Linda M. Radigan, 1684 12th Ave., PA/Communications.
William J. Rapaglia, 2090 Green St., Developer.
Linda M. Robertson, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer.
Nancy Schelholts, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect.
Daniel Schultz, 4999 24th Ave., President.
Carpenters.
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Physician.
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher.
Magie Sonier, 4388 17th St., Social Worker.
Donald N. Strauss, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, and safety equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Charles F. Butte, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst.
R.C. Caesar, 150 Tapeka St., Dentist.
Lester D. Cappone, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator.
Gordon Chin, 60 Castro St., Executive Director.
Jack W. Colbert, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser.
Harry V. Cuck, 920 Sacramento St., Minister.
G. DeFilippo, 601 15th Ave., Retired.
Doreen McLeod, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker.
James Fung, 4701 Del., Journalist.
Eva Y. Gardner, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer.
Alfred Gee, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker.
Kathleen A. Gee, 606 15th Ave., Nurse.
Thomas H. Gee, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Administrator.
Jennie Chin Hase, 434 21st Ave., Administrator.
Harry Lee, 157 Alton Ave., Physician.
Isham G. Ll, 119 Mendosa St., Physician.
End Ng Lim, 152 Jackson St., Community Liaison.
Russell Matsumoto, 127 Sweeney St., Attorney.
Inez McClaren, 472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher.
Avery Taylor Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect.
Thomas G. Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant.
Allen M. Okamoto, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker.
Frank R. Passantino, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist.
Bob F. Fox, 435 14th Ave., Businessman.
David Frowelor, 544 Union St., City Planner.
William H. Pryor, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director.
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Physician.
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANTASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Giantassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Giantassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker.
Linda Bartholomew, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress.
Carroll Arthur Bjorseth, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist.
Conception B. Caloja, 76 Vista St., Customs Aid.
Virginia Carroll, 328 Lisbon St., Salesperson.
Victoria Castillo, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator.
Julietta C. DeJesus, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate.
John M. Gonzales, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist.
John Green, 773 Lisbon St., Retired.
Robert V. Karp, 530 Brussels St., Deacon.
Richard Mathis, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver.
Charlie David McKay, 161 11th Ave., Doorman.
Ramona Michaels, 331 Bacon St., Secretary.
Jamey Muscat, Jr, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk.
Barbara Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader.
Vernon M. Ray, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter.
Dolores Robles, 217 Felixton St., Homemaker.
Ernest R. Robles, 217 Felton St., Steward.
Rev. William H. Ruth, 522 Shotwell St., Minister.
Darryl Franklin Sanchez, 225 Dadeo Ave., Secretary.
Clarence Correllis Smith, 646 Corbett Ave., Driver.
Robert Veande, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer.
Teresa C. Viermeza, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper.
Helen C. Walker, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly.
Punchita Rae Wright, 800 Goetgen St., Homemaker.
Judy J. Xuereb, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

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

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

ANDREW “DADDY” JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famyel Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I’d like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000, who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew “Daddy” Jones

The sponsors for Andrew “Daddy” Jones are:

ELLIS LEONARD

ANDREW LEONARD

ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe’ with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration — actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer — I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor — having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
- District Elections
- Affordable, quality childcare
- Funding for AIDS research/patients
- Vacancy Control
I oppose:
- Prop 64
- Militarization of the Bay
- City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.
As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco — not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statements are voluntarily submitted by the candidates and have not been checked by the candidates or any official agency.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
—I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

A.D. (Wyatt) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:
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JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly.
- Robert F. Barry, 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association.
- Miriam Blaustein, 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors.
- Harry G. Britt, 1992 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer, S.F. Community.
- Joel D. Eberly, 8 Stilt Blvd., Member of Congress.
- Agrilupio C. Cerbino, 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education.
- Angela Coppola, 208 Bush St., Business Executive.
- Carlota Teixidore del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator.
- Lee S. Dolson, 1501 Beach St., College Professor.
- Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor.
- Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister.
- Mike Hardenberg, 329 Wawona St., Union Official.
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
- James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU.
- Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired.
- Mike L. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- Bruce W. Lillenthal, 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission.
- Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California.
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Agency Director.
- John L. Moulari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
- Edward W. Moose, 1622 Powell St., Restaurateur.
- Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker.
- Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
- Rob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher.
- Richard Sanchez, 45 320 St., Pedestrian.
- Thelma Shelley, 70 Eveson St., Managing Director, War Memorial.
- Stephen Taber, 195 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood.
- Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly.
- Robert F. Barry, 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association.
- Miriam Blaustein, 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors.
- Harry G. Britt, 1992 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer, S.F. Community.
- Joel D. Eberly, 8 Stilt Blvd., Member of Congress.
- Agrilupio C. Cerbino, 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education.
- Angela Coppola, 208 Bush St., Business Executive.
- Carlota Teixidore del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator.
- Lee S. Dolson, 1501 Beach St., College Professor.
- Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor.
- Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister.
- Mike Hardenberg, 329 Wawona St., Union Official.
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
- James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU.
- Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired.
- Mike L. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- Bruce W. Lillenthal, 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission.
- Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California.
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Agency Director.
- John L. Moulari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
- Edward W. Moose, 1622 Powell St., Restaurateur.
- Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker.
- Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
- Rob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher.
- Richard Sanchez, 45 320 St., Pedestrian.
- Thelma Shelley, 70 Eveson St., Managing Director, War Memorial.
- Stephen Taber, 195 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood.
- Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public".

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
- Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
- Sala Burton, 8 Stilt Blvd., Representative in Congress.
- Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly.
- Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
- Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
- John L. Moulari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
- Harry G. Britt, 1992 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor.
- Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors.
- Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
- Dr. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor.
- VP Community College Board. Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College.
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid St., Consultant.
- Morris Bellstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor.
- Al Borvick, 234 Gates St., Attorney.
- John L. Burton, 766 Kansas St., Lawyer.
- H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Official.
- Mike Hardenberg, 329 Wawona St., Union Official.
- Agar Juckes, 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director.
- Rev. Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor.
- Gordan J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Attorney.
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Health Administrator.
- Sandra A. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator.
- Sal Rosell, 44 Bache St., Union Representative.
- Tomattra N. Scott, 1912-14 Broderick St., Program Monitor.
- A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas Ave., Minister.

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

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
Defend workers' rights against employers.
No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member.
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name________________________________________
Address_____________________________________ Apt. #____
Telephone No. (required)_______________________
Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐
Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s):___________
Second choice locations (if any)_________________
Signature_____________________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., President. S.F. Community College Board.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is — City College and the Centers Division — serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed — on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

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

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue.
My occupation is Educator.

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:


ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street.
My occupation is Executive Director.

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:


PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street.
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman.

My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:


Statesments are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation;
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and buildings and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSB president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.
Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Julie C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience; City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Uloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired).
Harry W. Frustuck, 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco.
Warren R. White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco.

GILMAN LOUIE
My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City’s public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.
Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College.
John YeHull Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Banker.
R. Hunter Morey, 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator.
Melvin L. Washington, 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales.
Juan R. Martinez, 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager.
Ralph Kuliger, 742 19th Ave., Police Officer.
Deeplinder Sekhon, 380 16th Ave., Banker.
Bok F. Pon, 435 14th Ave., Businessman.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Jene Rita Alviar, 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender.

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are: Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.
Jene Rita Alviar, 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender.

Candida Singh, 621), 850 40th Ave., Public Defender.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education. I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

STATMENTS ARE VOLUNTEERED BY THE CANDIDATES AND HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED FOR ACCURACY BY ANY OFFICIAL AGENCY.
Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molino Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sondonia M. Wilson, Ph. D.

The sponsors for Sondonia Wilson are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman.
Robert Barnes, 61 Eastline St., Personnel Manager.
Al Borves, 234 Gates St., Attorney.
Harry G. Britt, 1324 Page St., Supervisor. Rev. Amos C. Brown, Il
Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board.
Walter Lewis Brown, Jr., 2000 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer.
Sala Burton, 8 St. Frank, Representative in Congress.
Agripino R. Corbato, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
Henry Her, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco.
Naima T. Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner.
Grandval A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP.
Frederick E. Jordan, 230 Cresta Drive, Civil Engineer.
Willa B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. Leroy King, 758 Ameba St., Reg. Dir. ILWU.
John L. Molnar, 616th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors.
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor.
Lynette H. Renne, 375 Jack St., City Attorney.
Jean-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Union President.
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney.
Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Assistant to Rep. Burton. Benjamin Tom, 1771 Jones St., Member, Board of Education.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddox Ave., Community Activist.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to field out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. Dr. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board.
Lewis H. Butler, 44 Commons Ave., College Professor. James Corey Busch, 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive.
John Velhull Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal.
Harry J. Chevalier, 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. Steven J. Dei, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
Isabel Hui, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. Johnnie B. Johnson, 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman.
James Leach, 195 Borica Way, Minister.
Jeffrey Ken Mays, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council.
Peter J. Nardozza, 4086 26th St., Administrator. Gina Pastenetti, 1528 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant.
Lawrence J. Simi, 358 Ullon St., Parent.
Benjamin Tom, 1771 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education.
Ling-Chie Wang, 2479 Post St., UC Professor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas Ave., Minister.
Hannahal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). Sondonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest 38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can’t pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That’s the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless. Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter’s Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and

lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

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

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter’s Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco’s emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litiehi, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor’s Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engman, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco’s neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department’s Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumper will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residen-
tial districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .020 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City. When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire...the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A...fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wong
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Paterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

• Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Euneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

• Yes on Proposition A.
• Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catas-

trophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.
—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Steed, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, Dr. D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Conney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000? YES 276 NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$145,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$285,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone.
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Francisco.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground— with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways— at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Moscone Center Financing

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry. Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

*George Christopher, Former Mayor*

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $310,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends through the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

*John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors*

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxing families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

*Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor*
*Doris M. Ward, Supervisor*
*Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant*
*Julie Tang, Member, College Board*
*Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission*
*Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission*
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leaf, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

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

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilenthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

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

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lula Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want YOU to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout. This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing. Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engeman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Honer
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCON CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

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

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
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**Revenue Bond Procedures**

**PROPOSITION C**

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?  

**Analysis**

_by Ballot Simplification Committee_

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

**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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

**How Supervisors Voted on “C”**

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.  
The Supervisors voted as follows:  
None of the supervisors present voted No.

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48**

**SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:**

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Exception for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
**Revenue Bond Procedures**

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding." It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the $10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

*Submitted by the Board of Supervisors*

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

*Dianne Feinstein, Mayor*

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

*Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate*

**NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C**

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION C**

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

1. to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
2. to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
3. to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
4. to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
5. to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

---
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Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco the skills and self-confidence in sports and the arts.

Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school sports, arts and craft, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs — keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City — from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutter, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities. Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil. With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy. Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being. Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments. The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively. Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs. Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution. Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children’s future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up. For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world’s greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers. Proposition D will once again give San Francisco’s children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco’s children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krakow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shigig

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco’s children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportuniy. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need. Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbo, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denehein
J. Anne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sedonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support. Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children—close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers. Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Estes, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafal, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardel
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Cohlenitz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space... None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 770 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Melinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Labourers International Union #61
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union #48R
Plasterers & Stucco Workers Local #66
Richard D. Hungisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Penne

Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Filedrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Intl. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Gayton
Hub Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 66
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 2504-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren’t provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That’s not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That’s the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That’s why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It’s humane, and it’s only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law? — YES 287 — NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive “reciprocal pension benefits” under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

Controller's Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHarter AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.
Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law.

The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon  Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00  Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10  Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30  Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35  Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50  Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55  Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00  Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05  Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20  Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30  Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35  Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50  Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?  

YES 290  NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
Employee Reps. Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donny Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flinstrey
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from? Who writes them? Who pays for them? Why are there so many of them? Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293  NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

The Proposal: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A Yes Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A No Vote Means: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Poll Workers Needed

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker’s pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission’s annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of “comparable worth” and “pay equity.” I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It’s a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn’t contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can’t do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let’s try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require. After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first. The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year longstanding pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees’ salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees’ pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable. Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact “comparable worth” policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees’ salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That’s why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H’s moderate approach has won the support of community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men. Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carolee Textor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirsthberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margie Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overcome gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads...“notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?
Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?
Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date? YES 296 NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 1

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Chartermandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I— Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law.

Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting YES on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES  299

NO  300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election assistant, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: “This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen.” I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this “off” presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

“Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!”

(EDITOR’S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)
Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person’s taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco’s art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedenovsky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City’s art collections.

Philip Aype, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresa Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chintatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Salari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Rye, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Naip, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spalding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, ArtSpace
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PROPOSITION M
Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION M

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1983 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space. Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(l) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings. Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of buildings, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapplied for by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reappraisal specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grothoff
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 exist-

ing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behenna
August Cappola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lyric Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity. PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity. VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49% for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Past
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the high-rise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Addie and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winfred Cooper, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goede
Rita Sadek
Daniel Humphrey
Dr. Helen Sobell
Denise Kestler
Susan Taylor
Mary J. O'Brien

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;

- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city —
I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bards, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco’s Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City’s poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Neb Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louise
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartsman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Allison Brennan Kwanik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Shippard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood. Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip Dedardade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudilburgh

Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate. Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza

Tom Spinosa
Stanley Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Boston Gordon Chin Jim Elliot Geraldine Johnson Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor Al Lennon Mike Lighty David Leoman Dr. Juliane Malveaux Jose Medina Dennis Mosgorfan Joe Pussen Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City’s future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan’s growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board’s debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City’s small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco’s economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Doug Engmann Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Doris Kahn Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. Del Martin Hon. David Leoman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:
- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aaggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aftale
Angela Alito
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Parsley
Buck Bagot
John Bards
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Clebone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conit
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Oran
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denehe
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dobson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Estevas
Becky Evans
Don Feese
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gush
Gabriel Gesner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinze
Robert Herman
June Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Hussey
Carl Imparat
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kudish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayen

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kash
Mary Lane
Jim Lassonde
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lombard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphye McDonald
Paullette and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehling
Carole Migdien
Vivian Miller
Michael Minitorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinar
Jack Moore
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKee
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Fender

Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneek
Bill Sorre
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stiron
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strasser
Linda Suski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor

Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilesy
Marie Utzog
David Veale
Joel Ventress
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brian Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Westrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does involve is the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned — but potentially disastrous — tests for any building project anywhere in the City. This would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the Proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects — Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal
In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M destroys jobs, housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place
In San Francisco, we’ve fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Proposition M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

W.F. O'Keefe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraldo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 per cent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naiveté is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas Michael Bernick
Mark Buehl
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.

2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedence over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses”—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone’s economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer’s Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters Local #798
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Intl. Longshoremen’s & Warehousemen’s Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer’s Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster’s and Shop Hands Local #66

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City’s needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan’s innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won’t meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hempill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of “sugar coating” will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City’s workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luis Esquerr, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Eno Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called “conservationists”, the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco’s economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating jobs opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M’s priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City’s depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don’t let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It’s another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M’s extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City’s General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco cannot do without.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Asaiwa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant’s Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnelly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Welton Flynn, C.F.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Sperry, Owner, Night Club
Charm E. Sutten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Spraul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

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

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplans, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Wirzburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamazaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitation Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Meezy, Attorney
Caryl Meezy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the "neighborhood power" movement.

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fang, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M get's in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Eloise Westbrook, Retired

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

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? YES 308 NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Wille B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) Off-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise and air quality detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

“CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES” means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfills and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of (continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

According to the statement that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Keneally
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park Renovation Fund
(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs". To implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.
(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs". On expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation, and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985
Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of the

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986. This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

NOTE: This section is new.

8.4074 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(I) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent age adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of sup-
ervisors as in this section provided and appropri-
ations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fif-
ten dollars ($15) per month now provided in sub-
section (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons em-
ployed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman pro-
tective officer, police patrol driver or military leader, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of the reward is to be discrec-
tionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant there-
after, such member shall receive the rate of compensa-
tion attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-
wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certifica-
tion the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-
wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay-
will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities in-
cluded in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commis-
sion divided by the number of cities in said cer-
tification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maxi-
imum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensa-
tion paid firefighter classifications in regular ser-
vice in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum wages paid in regular service as certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commis-
sion for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-
age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-
ars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for special-
ized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type what-
soever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclu-
sive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to mem-
ers of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hose-
men, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire depart-
ment" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of depart-
ment, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritori-
ous conduct, and the form or amount of the reward is to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of cap-
tain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of com-
ensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bu-
reau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this sec-
tion. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(2), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified voters of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedule, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railroad need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.526 A Qualifications of Applicants for H-2 Permit

from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H-2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H-2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.583-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.583-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the remainder 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 8.583-5, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.582-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.582-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent 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 wife spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the remainder 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.582-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.582-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the remainder 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 8.583-5, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent 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 wife spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the remainder 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order.

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 133.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this chart, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employment of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the
Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been aban-
donned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding
any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g),
al projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional
office space shall be included in the
survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office
development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.
(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and
February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing
to the City Planning Commission at a public
hearing the list of all projects enumerated in
subsection (b) above, including the square
footage of each project and the total of all such
projects.
(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Depart-
ment's certification, the Commission shall
reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit estab-
lished in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000
square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the
Department's list is reduced to zero.
(e) If the City has authorized more than
475,000 square feet as part of the office de-
velopment competition set out in Subsection
321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4,
1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise
allowable square feet calculated pursuant to
subsection (d) above for the approval period
and for subsequent approval periods until the
total amount of square footage is reduced to
zero.
Section 321.2 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUC-
TION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to
reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection
321(a)(1).
Section 321.3 is added as follows:
SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF
EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS
AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT
AGREEMENTS.
Any office development approved pursuant
to a development agreement under Govern-
ment Code Section 65865 or any successor sec-
tion may only be exempted from the annual
limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after
the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly
scheduled election.
Section 325 is amended as follows:
SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.
The limit on office development set out in
Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and
324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the
voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in
effect until amended or repealed by the voters
of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.
PART 3—EMPLOYMENT
Be it ordained by the people of the City and
County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II,
of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Plan-
ing Code) is hereby amended as follows:
Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:
SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESI-
DENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING
PROGRAM.
(a) The City has determined in its certifica-
tion of the Downtown Plan Environmental Im-
 pact Report and in its findings and studies
leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the
Planning Code that San Francisco and region-
al traffic and transit problems will become
more intolerable as the number of non-resident
employees increases in San Francisco as a
result of new office development. In order to
mitigate those adverse traffic and transit im-
pacts, while protecting the City's residential
areas from unwanted increases in density, the
people determine that a policy of maximizing
resident employment training and placement
opportunities is needed.
Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:
(d) In order to ensure that the maximum
number of San Francisco residents are trained
and placed in employment opportunities in our
City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold pub-
lic hearings and not later than January 1, 1988
the City shall adopt legislation to establish a
program which will coordinate the job train-
ing and placement efforts of the San Francisco
Unified School District, the San Francisco
Community College District, community-based
non-profit employment and training programs,
and other agencies from the public and private
sectors, to assure maximum use of existing fed-
eral, state and local training and placement
programs, and to develop such additional
training and placement programs as deemed
necessary.
(e) Should the Board of Supervisors deter-
mine that additional funds are needed for pro-
grams established pursuant to subsection (d)
above, it shall consider the adoption of a San
Francisco Resident Training and Placement
Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a
condition of the approval of any application
for an office development project proposing the
net addition of 50,000 or more gross square
feet of office space.
PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE
If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a
court of law, or the application thereof to any per-
son or circumstance is held invalid, such invalid-
ity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative
or applications which can be given effect without
the invalid part or application hereof and to this
end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this
ordinance.
(c) The City and County of San Francisco
may commence an action to enjoin any actual
or threatened use, development or construc-
tion of any crude oil and gas processing and
support facilities in violation of this ordinance.
(d) Any person using, developing or con-
structing any crude oil and gas processing and
support facilities in violation of this ordinance
shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person
convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished
by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars
($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each
use, development or construction of such facil-
ities in violation of this ordinance shall consti-
tute a separate and distinct offense.
Section 5. Planning Commission Study.
(a) The City Planning Commission shall
study the need for permanent and comprehen-
sive controls and shall prepare prohibitory
legislation for the Board of Supervisors to con-
sider before the expiration of this ordinance or
any duly enacted extension.
(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commissi-
ion shall determine the following:
(1) The social, economic and physical im-
 pact of the use, development and construction
of crude oil and gas processing and support
facilities.
(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibi-
tion of the use, development and construction
of crude oil and gas processing and support
facilities.
Section 6. Severability.
If any provision or clause of this ordinance
or its application to any person or circumstance
is held to be unconstitutional or other-
wise invalid by any court of competent
jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect
other chapter provisions, and clauses of this
chapter are declared to be severable.
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**GOVERNADOR**

**Governor**

1. **JOSEPH FUHRRIG, Libertarian**
   Professor of Economics
   2 →

2. **GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican**
   Governor, State of California
   4 →

3. **TOM BRADLEY, Democratic**
   Mayor, City of Los Angeles
   6 →

4. **MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom**
   Educator
   8 →

5. **GARY V. MILLER, American Independent**
   Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
   10 →

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

12 →

**VICEGOVERNADOR**

**Lieutenant Governor**

1. **CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom**
   College Instructor
   16 →

2. **NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian**
   Author
   18 →

3. **JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent**
   Truck Driver
   20 →

4. **LEO T. MCCARTHY, Democratic**
   Lieutenant Governor
   22 →

5. **MIKE CURB, Republican**
   24 →

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

26 →
Secretary of State

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian  
Election Law Consultant  
Consultor de Leyes Electorales

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent  
Printer  
Impresora

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican  
County Supervisor  
Supervisor del Condado

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic  
Secretary of State of California  
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom  
Worker  
Trabajadora  
工人

Controller

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic  
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature  
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian  
Business Administrator  
Administradora de Negocios

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom  
Peace/Political Organizer  
Organizador Político/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican  
California State Senator  
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent  
Retired Electrical Director  
Director Eléctrico Retirado  
退休電工主任

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

Vote for One

Vote por Uno
Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent
Aviador 飛行家

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom
Union/Community Organizer 工会/社区組織者

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic
California State Treasurer 加州財政廳長

RAY CULLEN, Libertarian
Certified Public Accountant 註冊公共會計師

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長

ATTORNEY GENERAL

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic
Attorney General, California 加州州審判長

GARY R. ODOM, American Independent
Attorney 比利時 检察官

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian
Attorney, Private Practice 私人裁決

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom
Lawyer 律師

BRUCE GLEASON, Republican
Attorney-at-Law 比利時 检察官

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員

MEMBER, STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom
Medical Relief Coordinator 医療援助

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic
Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District 州平準局委員

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican
Business Executive/Controller 執行董事/總經理
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU, Republican</td>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECK McKinley, Libertarian</td>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. &quot;ED&quot; Vallen, American Independent</td>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian</td>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR
IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL ROCCO, Republican</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerente Corporativo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER, Democratic</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall EDWARD A. PANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Joseph R. Grodin</td>
<td>Yes 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Stanley Mosk</td>
<td>Yes 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>Malcolm M. Lucas</td>
<td>Yes 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal</td>
<td>John W. Holmdahl</td>
<td>Yes 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Division One</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal</td>
<td>William A. Newsom</td>
<td>Yes 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Division One</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Justice Court of Appeal</td>
<td>John Anthony Kline</td>
<td>Yes 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal</td>
<td>Allison Martin &quot;Al&quot; Rose</td>
<td>Yes 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice Court of Appeal</td>
<td>John E. Benson</td>
<td>Yes 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Division Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JAMES B. SCOTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall M. O. SABRAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall HARRY W. LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall DONALD B. KING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ZERNE P. HANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY” JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR*

*WRITE-IN*: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Member, Board of Education

| Name               |position| Vote 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jule C. Anderson</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rosario Anaya     | Incumbent/En posesión del cargo |211 |️
| Sodonia Wilson   | Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario| 212 |
| Greg Day          | Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes| 213 |
| Leland Yee        | Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador | 214 |
| Michael Moberg    | MBA, CPA | 215 |
| Myra Kopf         | President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación | 216 |
| Gilmam Louie      | Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras| 217 |
| William Felzer    | Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero| 218 |

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wotman</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moy Velasquez</td>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Silvestri</td>
<td>Educator/Educador</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riordan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/ Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan S. Wong</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Directors BART District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Garfinkle</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlo Smith</td>
<td>Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Spinosa</td>
<td>Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Peron</td>
<td>Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Políticas</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000.00) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000.00) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000.00).</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000.00) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000.00) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California’s public higher education institutions, including the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 19 campuses, the California Community College’s 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000.00) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss; community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Ley de Emisión de bonos Greene Hume de 1968 para la compra-apuro de edificios escolares. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares, dirigidos a financiar la construcción y mejora de escuelas. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Ley de Emisión de bonos Greene Hume de 1968 para la construcción de plantas primarias. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la construcción y mejora de plantas industriales. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Ley de Emisión de bonos Greene Hume de 1968 para hacer más segura la agua potable en California. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de sistemas de tratamiento de agua para reducir la contaminación y garantizar la disponibilidad de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Ley de Emisión de bonos Greene Hume de 1968 para financiar mejoras en las universidades y otras escuelas superiores. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Beneficios para los funcionarios constitucionales. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Impuestos sobre transacciones pelícuolas. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Elección del fiscal público. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Impuestos sobre el cambio de residencia. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Cooperación de funcionarios y empleados públicos y contratistas. Este proyecto permite la emisión de bonos con un valor de hasta $64 millones de dólares ($64,000,000) para financiar la mejora y expansión de las instituciones de educación superior. Las emisiones pueden ser vendidas en cantidades mayores de $4 millones de dólares ($4,000,000) al año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td>LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>YES 261</td>
<td>NO 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>NO 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>YES 269</td>
<td>NO 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>NO 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $440,000,000?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>YES 276</td>
<td>NO 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>YES 279</td>
<td>NO 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>YES 282</td>
<td>NO 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961, by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>YES 285</td>
<td>NO 286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

1. **IMPUESTOS LOCALES.** Para crear nuevas imposiciones o aumentar las existentes, los gobiernos locales deben aplicar la fórmula de los impuestos en proporción a los ingresos. Estos impuestos deben ser distribuidos en función de las necesidades locales y las poblaciones de las áreas ubicadas en las áreas rurales. Si los impuestos no son suficientes para cubrir el costo de las necesidades, se deben aumentar los ingresos de los gobiernos locales.

2. **RESTRICTIONS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1996.** Para emitir bonos con valor total de $44,000,000 para mejorar el sistema de protección contra incendios en las ciudades de Condonado y San Francisco.

3. **BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1996.** Para emitir bonos con valor total de $44,000,000 para mejorar el sistema de protección contra incendios en las ciudades de Condonado y San Francisco.

4. **Deberá construir la Ciudad edificios el Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiados por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Redefinición (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?**

5. **Deberá la Ciudad reclamar autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?**

6. **Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos o espacios abiertos?**

7. **Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asigna a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $500, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desde entonces en una cantidad proporcional?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities. (YES 261, NO 262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments. (YES 263, NO 264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken. (YES 266, NO 267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected. (YES 269, NO 270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco. (YES 273, NO 274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000?</strong> (YES 276, NO 277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</strong> (YES 279, NO 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</strong> (YES 282, NO 283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $30, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</strong> (YES 285, NO 286)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURESSubmitted to Vote of Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
<td>Y 287</td>
<td>N 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td>Y 290</td>
<td>N 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td>Y 293</td>
<td>N 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td>Y 296</td>
<td>N 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td>Y 299</td>
<td>N 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td>Y 302</td>
<td>N 303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposition L was removed from the ballot.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td>Y 305</td>
<td>N 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td>Y 308</td>
<td>N 309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF BALLOT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Apoyo</th>
<th>Contrario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de “beneficios recíprocos de jubilación” para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para otorgar aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la Ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por mujeres y hombres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Apoyo</th>
<th>Contrario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final de la balota
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

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

A 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

B 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT** (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS** — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And underutilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the 1/2% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

### Supervisor

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

### Board of Education

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

### Comm. College Board

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

### BART Board (if any)

- (1)

---

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/
Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board renews its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:


WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:


RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jeddia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the Oceanview, Merced and Ingoldsie Association. I received a grant to restore Oceanview Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:


nery. Richard N. Lerner, 67 Wawona St., Consult-


oper. Linda M. Robertson, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. Nancy Scheinholz, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. Daniel Schultz, 4199 24th St., Presi-


WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Fran-

cisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. Linda Barthelomeum, 15 A Heyman Ave., Waitress. Car-

ter. Dolores Robles, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. Ern-


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

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handymen Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:


ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Candidates for Supervisor

**BILL MAHER**

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

*Bill Maher*

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

**NICOLE MYERS**

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proprietor of Commercial Rent Arbitration—which actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
- District Elections
- Affordable, quality childcare
- Funding for AIDS research/patients
- Vacancy Control
I oppose:
- Prop 64
- Militarization of the Bay
- City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

*Nicole Myers*

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

**WENDY NELDER**

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

*Wendy Nelder*

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (Wyatt) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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JULIE TANG
My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984. I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco’s population and the future of San Francisco.

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

NANCY G. WALKER
My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I’ve enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I’ve worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I’ve helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I’ve helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I’ll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been “Open to the Public”.

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters’ income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers’ rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:


POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name________________________________________
Address__________________________ Apt. #_____
Telephone No. (required)______________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): __________
Second choice locations (if any)____________________

Signature_____________________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON
My address is 8 Slot Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN
My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI
My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant.
My age is 44.
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committee-man Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Gar-finkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Gar-finkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinaro."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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MOY VELASQUEZ
My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Velasquez are:

ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

PAUL WOTMAN
My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:
Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)
My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.
Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Julie C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY
My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

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

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District. (Retired).
Harry W. Frustuch, 947 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. Warren R. White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. Ralph O. Hillsman, 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco. (Retired).

The sponsors of Myra Kopf are:


MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors of Myra Kopf are:

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molino Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student’s spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students’ ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to cut out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273  NO 274

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest $38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless. Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery power packs so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. O'Connell, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

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

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter’s Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco’s emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco’s future. Unfortunately, we can’t guarantee another Bayview-type fire won’t happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter’s Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote “Yes” on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litchisler, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor’s Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Wille L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission

Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salerno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William E. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Loe, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco’s neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department’s Emergency Water Supplies.

• Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

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

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brun
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chun
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Leeman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mesy
Marlyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoichio Nakahama

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbazo, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Janene Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaske Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala

Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscon
Jonnie B. Johnson

Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipp
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Taty
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Penny Ruscio Walter
Bruce W. Lilenthal
Jim Wuchob

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

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1966, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
Mel S. Newman
John Holt
Mel S. Newman
Robert L. Kreutzberger
Jack R. Brower
Ed F. Paterson
August J. Nevola

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.
Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

• Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART’s a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Euneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Sanuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goodwin, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Sted, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Wender, M.D.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department
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PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?  

YES 276  
NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>145,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>285,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will generate more than half for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention-and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $2,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and all San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco paying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louise Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dotson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter C. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri

Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry. We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center. San Francisco is one of America’s favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city’s pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America’s most popular convention and trade show cities. Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden Linda Post Louise Minnick Sal Rosselli Ron Huberman
Lupe Carter Arlo Hale Smith Christopher Martin Ed McGovern Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can’t fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Bath and Jim Gravanis
Tony Killrey
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it’s already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don’t even have a financing plan that doesn’t count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks? B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.  This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels.  They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates.  The small hotels are doing fine.  And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.  Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco?  Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round.  The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year.  Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens.  Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Ensign
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCON CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

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

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street.  Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material.  Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?  

YES 279  NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may “refund” bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to “refund” old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Diana Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977;
2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Maris-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings,

fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282
NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97
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Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutter, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbede them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.
Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.
Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.
The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.
Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.
Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.
Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.
For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.
Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.
Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukov
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathanial H. Lewis
Jerry Shigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.
Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.
For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.
Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.
Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

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

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbasos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denehein
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph. D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children—close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Estes, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will

enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Morton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Topia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynne, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblenz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrrell J. Salmon
E. Porcher Hester
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.
As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.
In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

Harry G. Brins
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int’l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #970
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Clayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanton, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinaro, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union #40R
Plasterer’s & Shopfand’s Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driacoli, Commissioner
Raymond Weissberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaypee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?

YES 287

NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive “reciprocal pension benefits” under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive “reciprocal retirement benefits.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.

PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees’ Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees’ Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions

2:00 Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds

2:10 Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion

2:30 Proposition C—Bond Refinancing

2:35 Proposition D—Playground Funding

2:50 Proposition E—Retirement Pay

2:55 Proposition F—Retirement Benefits

3:00 Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions

3:05 Proposition H—Pay Equity

3:20 Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits

3:30 Proposition K—Art Curator

3:35 Proposition M—Planning Issues

3:50 Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? YES 290 NO 291

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
Employee Reps. Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donny Stevens
Robert McCollius
Wilson Mills
Charles Plintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweeteyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293  NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.
It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.
Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:
1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.
3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.
Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.
Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.
Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.
Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.
Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative “worth”.
Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.
Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.
The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker’s pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission’s annual study of City job classifications.
And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.
After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.
Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.
Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of “comparable worth” and “pay equity.” I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.
Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.
The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.
Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.
Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outdated attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.
Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.
Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
Johanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaacks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezy
Carol Mezy
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue. For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth. The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications. Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue. Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Ceballos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yorl Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Donnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borice
Sandy Ouye Mori

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale. Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men. Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives. Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Franciscans will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed. Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs. All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees. Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive. Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years. The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan. Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries. Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart’s long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments.

It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads... “notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Police & Fire Pay

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296  NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

69
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiating police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker          Harry Britt
Bill Maher            Carol Ruth Silver
Willie B. Kennedy     Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion, and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That’s why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I — Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice- Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraud, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice- Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenheim, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you — our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

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

It's not fair. Firefighters and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day. Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Caden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of “comparable” size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition “I” will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition “I” will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition “I” has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition “I” is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition “I” will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition “I”.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her granddaughter to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: "Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)
PROPOSITION K
Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examina-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paula Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresa Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiou, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earl-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marion, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Wm Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowski, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spandling Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Viznes, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace
PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305
NO 306

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PART I—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and contiguous statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART II—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of buildings, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaigns made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures were on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosholl
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Fat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Reife
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thelen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn’t true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let’s trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Julie Anderson, Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
James Bell, Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Lois Blanchard, Enolo Maxwell
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, A.J. Mitchell
Vera L. Clanton, Joel Mitchell
Terry Collins, Pat Norman
Darryl Cox, Carl Okorie
Ina Dearman, Jim Queen
Michael Edwards, Joe Rudolph
Barbara Garner, Hiram Smith
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd, Ida Strickland
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden, Charles Turner, Jr.
Rev. Roland Gordon, Amelia A. Ward
Rev. Martin Grizzell, Simeon White
Geraldine Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandinavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mostas, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wasser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City’s poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49c for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esto Seler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ADVISORY BOARD

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blausen
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cotrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goede
Rita Sadek
Daniel Humphrey
Dr. Helen Sobell
Denise Kessler
Susan Taylor
Mary J. O’Brien

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco:

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city — I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvace
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Cesar Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, wind swept canyons.
The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)
Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighborhood
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighborhood
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPOHLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.
But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.
Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That’s why City Hall is so afraid of it. That’s also why they are lying to you.

They don’t want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn’t.

They don’t want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don’t want you to know that YOUR priorities aren’t THEIR priorities. And that it’s not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it’s important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City’s zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned “Heavy Industrial.”

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don’t listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core “disappear” between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn’t produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no authority to “just say no.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say “no” to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chin
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Love
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Channale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigade
Robert De Vries
Bryan Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Chieng Gardner
Sandra Gartman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Vartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

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

As the largest single land development in San Francisco’s history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city’s needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city’s needs.

Judy Basson  Tom Jones
Philip Decendrada  Joe Passen
Jim Firth  Ruth Passen
Ruth Gravinas  Regina Speer
Kayren Hudibburgh  Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco’s policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area’s environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner  Tom Spinosa
Robert Silvestri  Stanely Bramwell
Mike Garza

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-
able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers’ campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 381,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants. Yet the City’s ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City’s job training and placement program enrolled only 3,824 students and placed only 1,641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Judy Boston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Witte B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Ioannou
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Morgoffian
Joe Passian
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City’s future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City’s small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin

We support Proposition M:

Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcasting Employees and Technicians Local 13
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighborhoods
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Francisco for Responsible Growth (SFRSG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Shinnan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAR)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams  Helen Beun  Linda Chapan
Eileen Adams  Nan & Howard Becker  Susan Cholone
Catherine Accardi  Hugh Bell  Marjorie Childs
Katharine Adams  Maurice Belote  Marie Cleasby
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen  William Benning  Elaine Coni
Honorable Art Agnos  Beverly Berg  Amy Cooper
Thomas Ahern  Honorable Susan Bierman  Neil Coperini
Darius Aisala  Lois Blanchard  Zach Cowan
Angela Altono  Dian Blumquist  Sun Crittuls
Boyd Allen  Michael Blumenthal  Ann Crow
Christopher M. Ames  Charles Bolon  Deniel D'Hyne
Jean Amos  Gray Brechin  Dorothy Dana
Dean Anderson  Selma Brown  N. Arden Durekakis
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley  Linda Boyd  Peggy da Silva
Buck Bagen  Georgia Brunan  John Davis
John Bardis  Arthur Brunwasser  Anne Marie Day
Robert Barnes  Dale Carlson  Honorable Libby Denebeim
Robert Barth  Robert Canning  Larry DeSpain
J. Peter Baumgarner  Rene Caseneuve  Carla Diamond

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman  Daniel Humphrey  Jack W.R. Kelly
Larry Granader  Harline Hurst  Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Jeannette Harris  Jerry Huruda  Tony Kilroy
Rick Hauptman  Sally Huyer  Kate Monica Klein
Dorothea Heitz  Carl Imparato  Susan Klugerman
Robert Herman  Joan Imbrato  John Knox
Jane Herog  Agar Jicks  Peggy Kopman
Bill Hester  Juan Alana Jelinek  Honorable Jean Kurtum
Sue Hester  Cynthia Joe  Steven Kreiling
Paul Hoor  Sharon Johnson  Henry Kroll
Don Hodapp  Hope Jolles  Ira Kurlander
Paul Hoar  David Jones  S.S. Kush
Don Hodapp  Elayne Jones  Mary Lane
Jan and Maur Holloway  Ruth and Morris Kadish  Jim Lansdowne
John Holczeclaw  Robert Katz  Norman Larson
Deborah Honig  Joe Kaufman  Polly Leyer
Victor Honig  Beatrice Levine  Peter Linenthal
Ralph House  Jennifer Kaysen  Dr. Larry Lipkind
Mike House  }
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Janice McVickar Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
Jane Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace MacAlaff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Pest
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Renselaer
Jim Rivaso
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rungf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Stillman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorra
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Sirting
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Straussner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swares
Louise Swig
Stephen Tabor
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Tradbly
Marie Uteig
David Wolfe
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkman Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Dees Brien Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Walter
Sue Wurzberg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamms Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

• Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of
Planning Initiative

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place
In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Proposition M destroys:
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY

James Haas
Michael Bernick
Mark Buell

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

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:
1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.
San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #98
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Lenny King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Maylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.
The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.
The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.
The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.
Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.
Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!
Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.
Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?
Don't be fooled by Proposition M.
The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!
It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.
Vote No on Proposition M.
Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Egguerra, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Porrillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:
- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M’s priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor people need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place — without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lai, Attorney
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnette, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eckman, Administrator
Terry A. Franqui, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRENO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brequx, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pia Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Flung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Roland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Eloise Westbrook, Retired
Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?  

YES 308
NO 309

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Brin, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.
(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.
(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.
(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.
(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.
(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.
"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:
(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;
(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;
(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;
(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEROF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinbefore described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 for the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, propery and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000; That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and said bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Keneley
Deputy City Attorney
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvements and development rights in, and to develop and maintain, land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained therefrom shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods" or lands on the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15 %) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10 %) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs".

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Comencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to a rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

The number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by law or custom, by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of or in the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward shall be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty, for the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensation and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum rates paid to firefighters in the respective fire departments of the cities certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said rates of compensation for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percent-age adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hose men, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

In the event of the death or retirement of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13 %) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that present-ly employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;
(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8,400 and 8,401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommenda-tion of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of em-ployees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commis-sion, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from exist-ing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the prov-isions of this section;
(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;
(5) Persons employed in positions in any depart-ment for expert professional temporary serv-ices, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;
(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service com-mission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely dis-abled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and imple-ment this subsection which shall include perfor-manence evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;
(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;
(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require cer-

ification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;
(7) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.
Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appoint-ment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the govern-ment of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.
(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be sub-ject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.
(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of em-ployees of the port authority as specified in Sec-tion 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 133.
(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6,404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for main-tenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing offi-cer as provided in this charter.
(e) All persons employed in the operating ser-vice of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall con-tinue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8,500(1) and 8,450 of the charter; provided, how-ever, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrange-ment.
All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the em-ploy of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service prov-isions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.
(f) All persons employed in the operating ser-vice of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.
(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall ex-cept as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.
(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil-service appointee assigned to the airport depart-ment under the public utilities commission im-mediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.
(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exhibition audi-torium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service po-sition in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
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reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 32(a)(t), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify to writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(t) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(t).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(t) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRIT-EN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.)

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRIT-EN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.)
### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Details</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer (Tesorero)</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PROCURADOR GENERAL)</td>
<td>(WRITE-ON) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>(WRITE-ON) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

- **Paul Kangas**, Peace and Freedom
  - Socialist Organizer
  - Organizador Socialista
- **Ed Zschau**, Republican
  - U.S. Congressman
  - Congresista Estadounidense
- **Breck McKinley**, Libertarian
  - Financial Consultant
  - Consultor Financiero
- **Edward B. "Ed" Vallen**, American Independent
  - Director, Patriotic Committee
  - Director del Comité Patriótico
- **Alan Cranston**, Democratic
  - United States Senator
  - Senador de Estados Unidos

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Representative

- **Mike Garza**, Republican
- **Theodore "Ted" Zuur**, Peace and Freedom
  - Worker
  - Trabajador
- **Sala Burton**, Democratic
  - Representative in Congress 5th District
  - Diputada en el Congreso
- **Samuel K. Grove**, Libertarian
  - Electronics Technician
  - Técnico en Electrónica

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参議員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de Negocios Independiente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor del Condado 市参議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Legislatura 議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Member of the State Assembly (MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL ROCCO</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerente Corporativo 大公の経営</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Judicial

### Supreme Court Justices

#### FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- **YES** 123
- **NO** 124

#### FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- **YES** 126
- **NO** 127

Shall EDWARD A. PANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- **YES** 129
- **NO** 130
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPREME COURT JUSTICES</th>
<th>(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td>Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td>Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td>Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>Shall JAMES B. SCOTT be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE</td>
<td>Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall M. O. SABRAW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR</td>
<td>Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNElL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>Shall HARRY W. LOW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>Shall DONALD B. KING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE</td>
<td>Shall ZERNE P. HANING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dental/Dentista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artist/Artista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR**

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
**Member, Board of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULE C. ANDERSON</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora 教育家</td>
<td>210 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>211 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA WILSON</td>
<td>Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario 教育委員長/大學行政主管</td>
<td>212 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAV</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes 青少年服務主任</td>
<td>213 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND YEE</td>
<td>Parent/Educador/Padre/Educador 家长/教育家</td>
<td>214 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>MBA, CPA/ 研究管理硕士、註冊公共會計師</td>
<td>215 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPP</td>
<td>President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación 金屬教育局主席</td>
<td>216 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMAN LOUIE</td>
<td>Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁</td>
<td>217 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師/工程師</td>
<td>218 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, Community College Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote No More than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WOTMAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人</td>
<td>222 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>223 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Educator/Educador 教育家</td>
<td>224 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIOJAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>225 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董</td>
<td>226 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董</td>
<td>227 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, Board of Directors BART District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任董事</td>
<td>231 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 神經/公共交通顧問</td>
<td>232 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 檢討員—財務顧問</td>
<td>233 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PERON</td>
<td>Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Políticas 政策研究分析員</td>
<td>234 ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issuance of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issuance of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贷成
236 NO 反对
238 SI 贷成
239 NO 反对
241 SI 贷成
242 NO 反对
244 SI 贷成
245 NO 反对
247 SI 贷成
248 NO 反对
250 SI 贷成
251 NO 反对
252 SI 贷成
253 NO 反对
255 SI 贷成
256 NO 反对
259 SI 贷成
260 NO 反对

LEY DE EMISSION DE BONOS COHESA-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPLEMENTACIÓN DE ESPACIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevos espacios para las escuelas en los estados de California. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

LEY DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE HUERNO PREVIOS. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevos espacios para las escuelas en los estados de California. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

LEY DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones de tratamiento de aguas para garantizar la seguridad del agua potable.

LEY DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORES EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTRAS ESCUELAS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones en las universidades y otras escuelas superiores en los estados de California. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

BENEFICIO DE JURISDICCION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Permite el acceso a bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones para los funcionarios del estado. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

INVESTIGA SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones para los funcionarios del estado. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Regula el cargo del Fiscal Público de las cantidades a ser asignadas. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

INVESTIGA SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones para los funcionarios del estado. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS DE EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y COMPUTADORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con el objetivo de financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones para los funcionarios del estado. Las cantidades serán de $500,000,000 para cada año.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TAXATION.</strong> For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE.</strong> Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS).</strong> Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS.</strong> Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 财成
288 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de “beneficios recíprocos de jubilación” para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

290 SI 财成
291 NO 反对

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausentan de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

293 SI 财成
294 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproportionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

296 SI 财成
297 NO 反对

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

299 SI 财成
300 NO 反对

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan a los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

302 SI 财成
303 NO 反对

¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 财成
306 NO 反对

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

308 SI 财成
309 NO 反对

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

FINAL DE LA BALOTA
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:  如何用自动投票机
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN  A 请特别注意
YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER. 如有错误，请向助理员换取新选票。

STEP 1  如第一手
Note: Si hace algun error, devuelva
su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS  如第二手
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE
WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la
tarjeta de voto completamente
dentro del “Votomatic.”

D 第一手
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2  如第三手
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE
STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN
OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二手
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接
合于二红点之上。

STEP 3  如第四手
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT
UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN
THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO
INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT
USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三手
请把带镂之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4  如第四手
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE
ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic”
y córtela bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四手
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空封
袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人应用。
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

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

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE**—Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

**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.

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

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

**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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)**—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

**BONDS**—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS**—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

**REVENUE BONDS**—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

19
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committee member I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of riders and taxpayers first.

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:
- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessible at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:
- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessy
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committee member.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:
- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
VOTER SELECTION CARD
(continued)

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Education
(1)----------------------
(2)----------------------
(3)----------------------

Comm. College Board
(1)----------------------
(2)----------------------
(3)----------------------

BART Board (if any)
(1)----------------------

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
Candidates for Supervisor

ANIEL ALIoto
My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it’s time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city’s costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must ensure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.
My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein’s and Supervisor John Molinari’s plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS
My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.
I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 300 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company

My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs
For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson.
Susan Brady Alfaro, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer.
David D. Ardoin, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor.
Robert B. Bacel, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney.
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Developer.
Jack Casford, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant.
Frances A. Condon, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife.
Kathleen Cormier, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St., Professor. Belle Full, 1000 Green St., Investor. Rick Hauptman, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager.
Robert L. Hogan, 3975 Clay St., Consultant.
Jennifer C. Houston, 22 Delgado St., Consultant.
Henriette Odell Humphreys, 340 Clay St., Financial Advisor.
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman.
Gordon J. Lau, 540 18th Ave., Attorney.
Richard N. Lerner, 67 Wawona St., Consultant.
Leroy Looper, 827 Guerrero St., Director.
Richard William Lowry, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant.
John J. Noonan, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver.
Linda M. Radigan, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications.
William J. Ragapella, 2090 Green St., Developer.
Linda M. Robertson, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer.
Nancy Scheinholz, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect.
Daniel Schultz, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Pharmacist.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of the world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembyman.
Charles E. Butte, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst.
R.C. Caesar, 150 Topka St., Dentist.
Leroy D. Caggione, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator.
Gordon Chin, 60 Castro St., Executive Director.
Jack W. Colbert, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser.
Harry V. Chuck, 920 Sacramento St., Minister.
Jerome G. DeFilippo, 60 15th Ave., Retired.
Doreen Der-McLeod, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker.
James Fong, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Eva Y. Gardner, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer.
Alfred Gee, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker.
Kathleen A. Gee, 606 15th Ave., Nurse.
Thomas H. Gee, 173 Anna Vista Ave., Retired.
Ennie Chin Hauze, 434 31st Ave., Administrator.
Harry Lee, 155 Alton Ave., Physician.
Jonah G. Li, 119 Mendosa Ave., Physician.
Enid Ng Lim, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liaison.
Russell Matsumoto, 272 Sweeney St., Attorney.
Inez McClaren, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher.
Avery Taylor Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect.
Thomas G. Moore, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant.
Allen M. Okamoto, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker.
Frank R. Passantino, 411 Maria Blvd., Dentist.
Bok F. Pun, 435 14th Ave., Businessman.
David Prowler, 544 Union St., City Planner.
William H. Pryor, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director.
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Physician.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant

My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker.
Linda Bartholomew, 15A Heyman Ave., Waitress.
Carol Arthur Bjorjestr, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist.
Conception B. Cailia, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aide.
Virginia Carroll, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson.
Victoria Castillo, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator.
Julieta C. DeJesus, 9009 Silver Ave., Staff Associate.
John M. Gonzales, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist.
John Green, 773 Lisbon St., Retired.
Robert V. Karp, 510 Brussels St., Deacon.
Mathew Mathis, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. Charleton David McKay, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. Ramona Michaels, 331 Bacon St., Secretary.
James Muscut, Jr., 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk.
Barbara Bay, 207 Olmsted St., Bookkeeper.
Vernon M. Ray, 207 Olmsted St., Carpenter.
Dolores Robles, 217 Felton St., Homemaker.
Ernest R. Robles, 217 Felton St., Steward.
William H. Ruth, 522 Showlow St., Minister.
Darryl Franklin Sanchez, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary.
Clarence Cornelius Smith, 646 Corbett Ave., Cub Driver.
Robert Vellarde, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer.
Teresa C. Vieraerez, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper.
Helen C. Walker, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly.
Panchita Rae Wright, 800 Goughing St., Homemaker.
Judy J. Xureb, 251 Harvard St., Bank Tender.
Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:


ANDREW “DADDY” JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I’d like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:


ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to sup' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER
My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS
My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
- District Elections
- Affordable, quality childcare
- Funding for AIDS research/patients
- Vacancy Control
I oppose:
- Prop 64
- Militarization of the Bay
- City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.
As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco— not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muniservices; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

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

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities.
I make San Francisco work for everyone.
—I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
—I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
—Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (Wyatt) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillantcourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscoan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of peo-ple who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

NANCY G. WALKER
My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

NANCY G. WALKER

DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"...

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Sylvia Weinstein

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care—not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.
Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.
Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Candidates for Supervisor

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ___________________________________________ Apt. #_____

Address ___________________________________________ Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________

Signature _______________________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Slot Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:
Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:
1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) helped thousands of families through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.
I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.
I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School’s employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Art Agno, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.
I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor’s Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco’s Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor’s Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

Statements are voluntarily submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Uloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are falling in school, so—Back to Basics: “Reading, Writing, Arithmetic”

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancel-
or/Supervisor, Community College District, Re-
tired. Mary W. Fraschutz, 147 Melrose St., Past
President of City College of San Francisco. Warren R.
White, 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of
San Francisco. Ralph O. Hillsman, 22 Huntington Dr.,
Vice President of City College of San Francisco, Re-
tired. John J. Brady, 1441 39th Ave., Retired CCSF
Administrative Dean. J. H. Conley, 569 Hill St., CCSF
Physics Dept. Head. Peter C. Gardner, 683 Miramar Ave.,
CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. Madeline
Mueller, 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head.
Grover Klemmer, 360 Castaneda Ave., Retired CCSF
P.E. Dept. Head. Lawrence B. Wong, 64 Sycamore St.,
Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. Edward Dierauf,
553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. Leo S.
Dolson, Ph.D. 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instruc-
tor. JoAnn Hendricks, 2300 35th Ave., CCSF Business
Instructor. Julius J. Jelinek, 1080 Alabama, Retired
CCSF Engr. Instructor. Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean
Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. Veronica Hunicutt,
55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. N. V. Deg-
gendorfer, 660 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engr.
Instructor. Stephen R. Levinson, 17 7th Ave., CCSF
English Instructor. C.F. Maloney, 326 Santa Ana Ave.,
CCSF Counseling Instructor. Manfred E. Welker,
1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. Paul S.
Hungerford, 151 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin.
E. Patricia Lucy, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney.
Frank J. Sarina, 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police
Lt. John Statterey, 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFPD
Fireman. Ike Felzer, 2107 14th Ave., Retired General
Contractor. A. John Shimmon, 19 Middletield Dr.,
Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. Ar-
thur J. Goedeewagen, 2283 37th Ave., President S&P
Education Executive Action Committee. Mae V.
Sponn, 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Agent Commis-
sion. Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Past President,
Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. Cecilia B.
Hochhauser, 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE
Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF
My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco
Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an
educator, parent of three public school edu-
cated children, PTA leader, and school
board member, I have a proven record of
leadership, integrity, caring, and effec-
tiveness.

My colleges elected me President of the
National Council of Great City Schools, President
of the Association of California
Urban School Districts, and twice President
of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the
education and administration of our school
district, I have kept constant a vision of a
school system where each child has fair and
equal opportunity for honest and effective
education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly-
man. June Rita Alviar, 2537 Bryant St., Community
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Man-
agement. Catherine J. Dood, 1382 26th Ave., Regis-
tered Nurse. Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D., 1501 Beach St.,
Professor. Carlota Texidor del Portillo, 84 Berkeley
Way, Educator/Civic Service Commission. Libby
Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education.
Susen Eisenberg, 131 14th Ave., Health Administra-
tor. James M. Foster, 1830 Eddy St., Commis-
ioner. Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff.
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Commu-
nity Activist. Antonio E. Juanillo, 5 Montecito Ave.,
President Filipino-American Council. James W. Kearney,
160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. Enola D. Max-
well, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. Frances M.
McAfee, 130 Santa Anna Ave., Recreation and Park
Commissioner. Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave.,
Lieutenant Governor. Jacqueline Nemerovski, 40
Seaview Ter., Arts Commission. Juanna Owens,
371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner.
Louise H. Rennie, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
James A. Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Con-
sultant. Fred A. Rodriguez, 523 Oak Park Drive,
Recreation & Park Commissioner. Joan-Marie Shel-
ey, 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. Will
Tsuchimoto, 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker.
Martin S. Weiner, 2266 California St., Rabbi.
Nancy G. Wilker, 355 Green St., Supervisor. Malcolm S.M.
Watts, 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. Michael Wong,
590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE
My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation
President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of
San Francisco, I graduated from our
City’s public schools and received an honors
degree from San Francisco State University.
I am president of a computer software com-
pany and employ 18 people. I am a member
of the Family Life and Health Committee
and the Affirmative Action Committee of the
San Francisco School District. I chair the
Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee
of Downtown Community College; and
volunteer as a teachers aide bringing com-
puter skills to the classroom. My priorities
are: teaching English skills, improving math
and science skills, setting performance goals
for students and teachers and rewarding
educators for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Com-
munity College. John YehHall Chin, 3146 Lyon St.,
Banker. R. Hunter Morey, 515 John Muir Dr., Social
Worker/Sex Educator. Melvin L. Washington, 1 St.
Francis Pl., Sales. Juan R. Martinez, 2864 Bryant St.,
Operations Manager. Ralph Kugler, 742 19th Ave.,
Police Officer. Deepinder Sekhon, 380 16th Ave.,
Michael A. Kelly, 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. Shirley
Shigeko Murakami, 833 44th Ave., Secretary.
Lawrence G. Barbu, 2409 Scott St., Consultant.
Kristen R. Coston, 2444 Great Highway, Student.
Kay Kondo Ostishi, 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. Angela
Chu, 525 Judah St., Social Worker. Phuong VY Le,
4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. Kenneth R. Han-
son, 235 Warren Dr., Grocer. George M. Eastes, 1818
Page St., Printer. Faustino C. Saito, 401 Itally St.,
Broiler Plant Mechanic. Louis Hop Lee, 788 18th Ave.,
Lawyer. Angela G. Rando, 139 23rd Ave., Self-
employed/Delicatessen owner. Michael D. Denton,
127 Steiner St., Salesman. Ricky Wong, 1651 30th
Ave., Insurance Agent. Dorothy M. Campbell, 360
Crezlake Dr., Retired. Joseph S. Quan, 574 18th Ave.,
Retired. Susan B. Lee, 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engi-
neer. Sammy A. Castilo, 144 Clapper St., Pharma-
cist. Wilbur Wuo, 34 Marvel Court, Educator. George
Okamoto, 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. Richard Sanchez
M.D., 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. Albert Sum, 1750
33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman.
Robert Barnes, 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager.
Al Borlace, 234 Gates St., Attorney.
Harry G. Britt, 1592 Page St., Supervisor, Rev. Amos C. Brown, III
Dorothy Cantor, 850 Lakeview Blvd., Supervisor.
Kathleen Caruso, 1291 Stanyan St., District Attorney.
Doris R. Thomas, 1297 Stanyan St., Board of Supervisors.
Wendy Nelder, 1291 Stanyan St., Supervisor.
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney.
Dorothy E. Springer, 1592 Mission St., Attorney.
Joseph M. Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.
Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:
Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher/Paraprofessional.
Nelson Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker.
Frederick W. Walters, 1145 A Pine St., Electronic Technician.
Phoebus Wilson, 1590 Lakeview Blvd., Retired City Employee.
Dorothy V. Ryan, 850 Lakeview Blvd., Retired Accountant.
Louis Green, 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife.
Kenneth L. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist.
Richard Riley, 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent.
Nancy E. White, 660 Hearst Ave., Retired Banker.
Paul Montalvo, 35 Gaviota Way, Retired Banker.
Linnard Cantor, 850 Lakeview Blvd., Retired - Store Owner.
Susan Greenfield, 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber.
Jeanette Briscoe, 660 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk.
Richard W. Shuttleworth, 222 Molino Dr., Salesman.
Theresa R. Cantor, 608 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business.
Fred R. Briscoe, 660 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express.
Dorothy E. Bridgeman, 457 Myra Way, Secretary.
Alfred K. Shivers, 159 Mario Dr., Military Personnel Technician.
Michael C. Wilson, 2122 Mission St., Federal Civil Service.
Richard A. Evers, 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel.
Hazel E. Hurdi, 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk.
Barbara Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife.
Joseph M. Salcido, 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:
J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physicians/Parent.
Dr. Amos C. Brown, 113 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Governing Board.
Lewis H. Butler, 44 Commonwealth Ave., Community College Professor.
James Corey Busch, 205 Buchanan St., Sports Executive.
Eileen Caplan, 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist.
Agripino R. Ceballos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer.
John Vehal Chin, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal.
Harry J. Chueh, 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister.
Henry Der, 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director.
Steven J. Doh, 1512 Larkin St., Attorney.
Celine Henderson, 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant.
Isabel Huie, 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner.
Ann Blumlein Lazarus, 5 65th Ave., Businesswoman.
Jeffery Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council.
Peter J. Nourdoz, 4086 26th St., Administrator.
John E. Pannestri, 1324 Clayton St., Administrator.
Lawrence J. Sam, 355 Ulloa St., Parent.
Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Member of the Board of Directors.
Benjamin Top, 717 Jones St., Commissioner.
Sara Burton, 515 47th Ave., Supervisor.
Ronakabakayashi, 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League.
L. Lung-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., UC Professor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilithas Ave., Minister.
Nanabill A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian).
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.
PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

- Bond Redemption $46,200,000
- Bond Interest 38,808,000
- Debt Service Requirement $85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Gesorgenine, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department
Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco. Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City. When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools. Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask all citizens to join us and VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Ceballos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Dennebeim, Member, Board of Education
Johnnie Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906. Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens. Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes. Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system. Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaacks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire . . . the biggest threat to San Francisco. We urge a YES vote on Proposition A . . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman  Michael S. Newman
John Holt  Mel S. Newman
Robert L. Kreagberger  Jack R. Brower
Ed F. Patterson  August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster — earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

• 94 underground cisterns will be built.
• 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
• The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

• Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Mathews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Yes on Proposition A.

Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.

— San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A — YES
Proposition M — YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Strauf, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werderger, M.D., M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department
Moscone Center Financing

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

- Bond Redemption $140,000,000
- Bond Interest $145,600,000
- Debt Service Requirement $285,600,000

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths (0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning — solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously — one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually — a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually — a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously — but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone...
for the City’s General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City’s coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City’s convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry’s needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco’s visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco’s future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It’s a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco’s number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco’s essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can’t compete with other cities’ and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayers families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie R. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Roug, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

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

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stagehands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future. Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pyle, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milan Markov, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city’s economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city residents. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city’s convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco’s convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let’s not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco’s convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That’s why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco’s convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don’t let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner           Lisa Klobucar            Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell          Tom Spinosa
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks? B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravani
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman

Lula Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.
Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $440,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City? YES 279  NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation programs would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D., Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Floyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

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

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world’s greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggers
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shigle

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Donedheim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sondoria M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Bruce Rahul, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Murtton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinar
Louise K. Molinar
William Cohenitz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

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

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City. Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space... None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city’s children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition I, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285  NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation— but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E”

Harry G. Brit
Carol Ruth Silver
Plumbers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int’l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Dayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT #61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local 821
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

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

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition “E” on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “E”.

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “miscellaneous” applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for “miscellaneous” retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrnm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F
Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law? 

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hap Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters’ Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing Proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new. 8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law.

The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon  Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00  Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10  Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30  Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35  Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50  Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55  Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00  Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05  Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20  Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30  Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35  Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50  Proposition N—Oil Facilities
Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290

NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hephburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Fittroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alston Sweetwoyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293

NO 294

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

Poll Workers Needed

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, intermediate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes are merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President, Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

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

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carolina Reisal del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Hut, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migdan, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jure, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Pett, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margal Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H!

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.
End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.
San Franciscans For Bart Safety
Police & Fire Pay

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

69
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker  Harry Britt
Bill Maher     Carol Ruth Silver
Willie B. Kennedy  Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That’s why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has not been given.

Proposition “I” will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition “I” is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Proposition “I”.

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples’ need for justice and equity under the law.

Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However, due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad-based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them — be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.
Police & Fire Age Requirements

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments? YES 299 ≠ NO 300 ≠

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation’s capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

The Promise Fulfilled

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: “This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen.” I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this “off” presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors. To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: “Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!”

(EDITOR’S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar’s City Hall office.)
PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 NO 303

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101
NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examina-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Philip Agee, Artist
Paul Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Teresie Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstone, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Roe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, ArtSpace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

**The Master Plan**

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

**Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions**

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

**Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment**

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

**Training and Placement Fee**

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

**What Your Vote Means**

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordered by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That our adverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(j) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) “Approval period” shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) “Office development” shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

2. Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) “Preexisting office space” shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessible to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(l) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 32.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City’s politics and the City’s economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City’s Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced “one-crop” economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen’s initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures were on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:
Dick Grubb
Dennis Antonore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses; we can’t drive our cars, and we certainly can’t park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called “controls” in current City Planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction. Don’t be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Bothe
Richard Sidar

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiel Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City’s arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City’s diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thellem, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city’s youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods - higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49c for every dollar earned by men - 10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people going lack. Nine out of ten recipients of social services monies are women - but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phylis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Elsa Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

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

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives — higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city — I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

San Francisco’s Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City’s poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanislaus-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chin
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Bragade
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Garreton, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnink
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Varasile
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

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

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Banton
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudibburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zieidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City’s ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City’s job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie R. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Joe Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City’s future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan’s growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board’s debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City’s small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco’s economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.
Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Coy Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greensbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)

Moni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sanjuan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Surplus Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams  
Eileen Adams  
Catherine Accardi  
Katharine Adams  
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen  
Honorable Art Agnos  
Thomas Ahern  
Darius Adala  
Angela Alito  
Boldd Allen  
Christopher M. Ames  
Jean Amos  
Dean Anderson  
Karen Apana & Peter Purssley  
Buck Bagot  
John Bardis  
Robert Barnes  
Robert Barth  
J. Peter Baumgartner  
Helen Bean  
Nan & Howard Becker  
Hugh Bell  
Maurice Belote  
William Benning  
Beverly Berg  
Honorable Susan Bierman  
Lois Blanchard  
Dian Blonquist  
Michael Blumlein  
Charles Bolton  
Gray Brehin  
Selma Brown  
Linda Boyd  
Georgia Brittan  
Arthar Brunswasser  
Dale Carlson  
Robert Canning  
Rene Casenave  
Linda Chapman  
Susan Chelone  
Marjorie Childs  
Marie Cleasby  
Elaine Coni  
Amy Cooper  
Neil Copertini  
Zach Cowan  
San Crillolas  
Ann Crow  
Denise D'alone  
Dorothy Dana  
X. Arden Danekas  
Peggy da Silva  
John Davids  
Anne Marie Day  
Honorable Libby Denebein  
Larry DeSpain  
Carla Diamond  
Jerome Dodson  
Herbert Donaldson  
Ella Driscoll  
Alvin Duskin  
Michael Edwards  
John Elberling  
Ed Emerson  
Honorable Douglas Engmann  
Frank Eppich  
Roberto Esteves  
Becky Evans  
Don Feaster  
Rhoda Feldman  
James Flower  
Ann Fogelberg  
Nancy Foley  
James Frankel  
Tully Friedman  
Edwin Gabay  
Marcia Gallo  
Ellis Gans  
Jim Gardner  
Marsha Garland  
Bettie Garvey  
Gustavia Gash  
Gabriel Gesner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman  
Larry Granader  
Jeanette Harris  
Rick Hauptman  
Dorothea Heintz  
Robert Herman  
Jane Herzog  
Bill Hester  
Sue Hester  
Paul Hoar  
Don Hodapp  
Jan and Maur Holloway  
John Holzclaw  
Deborah Honig  
Victor Honig  
Ralph House  
Mike Housh  
Daniel Humphrey  
Harline Hurst  
Jerry Hurrado  
Sally Huysen  
Carl Imparato  
Joan Iniator  
Agur Jaques  
Juan Ana Luz Jelinek  
Cynthia Joe  
Sharon Johnson  
Hope Jolles  
David Jones  
Elayne Jones  
Ruth and Morris Kadish  
Robert Katz  
Joe Kaufman  
Jennifer Kayser  
Jack W.R. Kelly  
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum  
Tony Kilroy  
Kate Monaco Klein  
Susan Klugerman  
John Knox  
Peggy Kopman  
Honorable Jean Kortum  
Steven Krofking  
Henry Kroll  
Ira Karlander  
S.S. Kush  
Mary Lane  
Jim Landowme  
Norman Larson  
Polly Layer  
Beatrice Levine  
Peter Linenthal  
Dr. Larry Lipkind  
Lorraine Lowe  
Joan Lombard  
Kevin Malone  
Honorable Susan Martin  
Ralphynke MacDonald  
Paulette and Robert Hale  
McConnell  
Helen L. McGill  
Liz Milazzo  
Frederick Miller  
Maurice Lim Miller  
Frank Mastro  
Nan McGuire  
Will McKay  
John Mehring  
Carole Migden  
Vivian Miller  
Michael Minhorn  
Stephanie Mustak  
Tim Molinar  
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morte
Betsy Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O’Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender

Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Striton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strasser
Linda Stupak
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor

Paul Thurston
Ellen Trubilby
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visser
David Vogel
Daniel Volkman Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Werthrich
Lyke Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yerman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm’s Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be replaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime.

Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of
rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.
- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

**Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place**
In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

*Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This badly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

*Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

**Proposition M destroys:**
- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

**Proposition M will:**
- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a shortsighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City’s neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!**

*Supervisor Wendy Nelder*

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M**

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

*W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association*
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from buying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY

James Haas
Michael Bernick
Mark Buell
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.

2. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!
Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may “change existing neighborhood uses”—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would “overburden our streets.” Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don’t be fooled by Proposition M.

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone’s economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer’s Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Hilier L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry King, Regional Director, Int’l. Longshoreman’s & Warehouseman’s Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer’s Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster’s and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a plan that balances the City’s needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan’s innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won’t meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of “sugar coating” will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City’s workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leonardo P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luise Esquivio, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlos del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City’s potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don’t need and we can’t afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that “existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced.” Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City’s tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all City residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City’s economic viability, but stops unnecessary high-rises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City’s economic base. Proposition M’s meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That’s why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco’s future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City’s Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.

- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M’s priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City’s neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rev. Victor L. Medears, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called “conservationists”, the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco’s economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M’s priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City’s depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don’t let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Natsumo Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant’s Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Vine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Delson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Wend Donnelly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restaurant
H. Velon Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Pugh, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scotia, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Sperry, Owner, Nighthawk Club
Charna E. Stuten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peer A. Rothchild, Broker, Rothchild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It’s another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M’s extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City’s General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dornan L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Debbes, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Luan, Attorney

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

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Constance C. Hatcher
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jermain, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan J. Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemeroski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jone Ortiz-Obraido, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamashita, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Huantha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Lung Jang, President, Lung Kong Assoc.
Frank Fang, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Lundy F. Eng
Rolland Love M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elonise Westbrook, Retired
Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308

NO 309

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N: “Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.
• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase cost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

“CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES” means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of (continued on page 103)
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCREASE BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY, ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREBY REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electorate of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

1. FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purpose set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the “Recreation and Open Space Programs” to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as “high-need neighborhoods”. Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400(a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”, or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing and new recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund’s existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to “high-need neighborhoods”; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current “Recreation and Open Space Program” no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in “high-need neighborhoods” identified in the then current “Recreation and Open Space Programs”.

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the “Recreation and Open Space Programs”, on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member’s effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.
8.519 Retirement System Credit for Represent-ative Service
Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full
time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full
time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this
section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the
rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation
shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two
highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmission of all contributions which
would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement
system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordi-
narily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions.
If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those con-
tributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding para-
graph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus
interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be
used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement
allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest
who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to
representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement
system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.
8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.
The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey
comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and
women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and
women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of
similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use
of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall
complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or
before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year
thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay
recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided
that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service
commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such
adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of sec-
tion 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated
by bold faced type; deletions are indi-
cated by line-through type.
8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments
(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each
year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of
compensation paid police officers or patrol
officers employed in the respective police depart-
ments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in
the State of California, based upon the latest fed-
eral decennial census. For the purpose of the civil
service commission's survey and certification the
rates contained in said certification shall be the
average of the maximum rates paid to each police
officer or patrol officer classification performing
the same or essentially the same duties as police
officers or patrol officers in the City and County of
San Francisco.

Therupon the board of supervisors shall have the
power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to
fix rates of compensation for the members of the
city department whose annual compensations are
set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and
suggested rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensa-
tions and shall be effective from the first day of
July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said
ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter
for police officers, police patrol drivers and
women protective officers the compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum
wage paid to police officers or patrol officer clas-
sifications in regular service in the cities included
in the certified report of the civil service commis-
sion. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph
shall mean the sum of the maximum averages cer-
tified by the civil service commission divided by
the number of police officer classifications in citi-
es in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service
for police officers, police patrol drivers and
women protective officers shall be established in
accordance with the general percentage differential
between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service
commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department
other than police officers, police patrol drivers and
women protective officers shall include the
average percent of adjustment as that established
in said ordinance for police officers in the fourth
year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the
fractional amount which may result from per cent-
age adjustment specified in this section, half dol-
ars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.
The rates of compensation set forth in the
budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriation therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department only for heroic or meritorious conduct. The sum or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" as used in this section shall include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(2), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(c) Not later than the 25th day of each month, the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission.

The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event the said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H-2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of this charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H-2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from List E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of List E-25, Class H-2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member’s final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member’s final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month following the attainment by them of the age of sixty years: A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent 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 wife 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, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempted positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempted position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

(7) (9) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1). Subsection 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 323 is amended as follows:

SECTION 323. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 520, 521, 522, 523 and 324 as amended by voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may, in addition to any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Ongoing Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.
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CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN,</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gobernador, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY V. MILLER, American Independent</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuidad Universitaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Governor</td>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>College Instructor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESA &quot;TEA&quot; DIETRICH</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAAG</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEF</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Treasurer (TESORERO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CULLEN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### (PROCURADOR GENERAL)

**Attorney General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY R. ODOM, American Independent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Medical Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU, Republican</td>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECK MCKINLEY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Financial Consultant</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD B. &quot;ED&quot; Vallen, American Independent</td>
<td>Director, Patriotic Committee</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian</td>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
# Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL ROCCO</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

---

## General Election
November 4, 1996

### Supreme Court Justices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Rose Elizabeth Bird</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Cruz Reynoso</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>Edward A. Panelli</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ALLISON MARTIN &quot;AL&quot; ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT OF APPEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall JAMES B. SCOTT be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 158</td>
<td>NO 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall ROBERT W. MERRILL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 161</td>
<td>NO 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall CARL WEST ANDERSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 164</td>
<td>NO 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall M. O. SABRAW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 167</td>
<td>NO 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall WILLIAM R. CHANNELL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 170</td>
<td>NO 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall HARRY W. LOW be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 173</td>
<td>NO 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall DONALD B. KING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 176</td>
<td>NO 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall ZERNE P. HANING be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 179</td>
<td>NO 180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Name                         | Position and Details                                                                 | Vote
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM GEE</td>
<td>Dentist/Dentista</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS</td>
<td>Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. (WYATT) NORTON</td>
<td>Artista/Artista</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE MYERS</td>
<td>Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET SHIRLEY</td>
<td>Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND COATS</td>
<td>Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## Member, Board of Education

**JULIE C. ANDERSON**  
Educator/Educadora 教育家  
Vote: 210

**ROSARIO ANAYA**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員  
Vote: 211

**SODONIA WILSON**  
Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario  
Vote: 212

**GREG DAY**  
Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jóvenes 青少年服務主任  
Vote: 213

**LELAND YEE**  
Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家  
Vote: 214

**MICHAEL MOBERG**  
MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士/註冊會計師  
Vote: 215

**MYRA KOPP**  
President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación 雲金山學校局主席  
Vote: 216

**GILMAN LOUIE**  
Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁  
Vote: 217

**WILLIAM FELZER**  
Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師  
Vote: 218

## Member, Community College Board

**PAUL WOTMAN**  
Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師／小商人  
Vote: 222

**MOY VELASQUEZ**  
Educator/Educador 教育家  
Vote: 223

**ROBERT SILVESTRI**  
Educator/Educador 教育家  
Vote: 224

**JOHN RIOJAN**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董  
Vote: 225

**ROBERT E. BURTON**  
Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 雲金山社區大學校董  
Vote: 226

**ALAN S. WONG**  
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董  
Vote: 227

---

**THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT**  
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greene-Hughes School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California’s public higher education institutions, including the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 19 campuses, the California Community College’s 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retirement Benefits for Constitutional Officers. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Taxation. Family Transfers. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elected District Attorney. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Taxation. Replacement Residences. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Official, Employee, Contractor Compensation. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighed by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 買成
236 NO 反對

238 SI 買成
239 NO 反對

241 SI 買成
242 NO 反對

244 SI 買成
245 NO 反對

247 SI 買成
248 NO 反對

250 SI 買成
251 NO 反對

252 SI 買成
253 NO 反對

255 SI 買成
256 NO 反對

259 SI 買成
260 NO 反對

LEYES DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE IHIGUER-HUGHES DE 1966 PARA LA GANAR-FAHNIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de ciento millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos podrán ser vendidos a entidades como bancos o sociedades de crédito para que financien el proyecto de la construcción de las escuelas.

LEYES DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1980 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correctivas destinadas para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de cuarenta millones de dólares ($40,000,000) cada uno.

LEYES DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1980 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas de distribución de aguas para ahorrar las costos de insumos de seguridad del agua potable.

LEYES DE EMISSION DE BONOS DE 1980 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORA EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar la construcción de nuevas instalaciones en las universidades y los colegios superiores en California. Incluye la mejora de la infraestructura de los centros educativos privados y públicos.

BENEFICIO DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Permite a los funcionarios constitucionales jubilarse con un beneficio de jubilación total de $30,000 para el estado, que son los beneficios que obtienen los funcionarios del gobierno por la jubilación.

IMPUTES SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Este impuesto se aplica a las transferencias que se hacen entre familiares, como la transmisión de propiedades, y se utiliza para financiar programas de salud y educación.

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Regula que el cargo de Fiscal Publico de las cortes sea electo por el pueblo, y que el cargo de Fiscal Publico de los condados sea electo por los electores de los condados.

IMPUTES SOBRE LA VENTA DE HOGARES. Se imponen impuestos sobre la venta de hogares para financiar programas de vivienda y vivienda social.

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impone un límite a la compensación total anual para funcionarios públicos y empleados públicos, estableciendo en cerca de $25,000 el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad al nivel local. Estos límites son establecidos para evitar la retribución excesiva.

(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1960)
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

#### State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies’ existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure’s cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measures were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### City & County Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPUESTAS PARA SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Impuestos Locales. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentar los actuales, los gobiernos locales y distritales necesitan los dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos específicos), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impuesto fiscal: Establecer nuevas o más altos impuestos generales por gobiernos locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir las presiones fiscales por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no rechazan la continuación de nuevas o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 de Agosto de 1966. Las previsiones que impiden multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no son aplicables a ciudades con Constitución.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>UDIGNA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés sea el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permíta la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impuesto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los impuestos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatales.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el parar o vivir el virus de la enfermedad de inmunodeficiencia humana (VIH) es una condición contagiosa y obliga a los gobiernos locales y del estado a proporcionar tratamiento y mantenimiento de la condición. Impuesto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variará grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplican a los impuestos existentes de impuestos de gobiernos locales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no ha sido un costo substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los gobiernos podrían invertir cientos de miles de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomanan.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGA Y EXPOSICIÓN A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohíbe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia sobre la exposición a sustancias químicas tóxicas. Impuesto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley en nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependen de muchas factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $200,000. Los costos serían reducidos paulatinamente por las multas que fueran impuestas.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1966. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejorar en el sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reurbanización (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000,000.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para comprar y desarrollar propiedades baldíos o espacios abiertos.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $59, y a aquellos que se jubilaron después en una cantidad proporcional?</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

#### (ELECCION GENERAL DE 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Deberá la ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo después de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para comprar y desarrollar propiedades baldíos o espacios abiertos.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la ciudad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $59, y a aquellos que se jubilaron después en una cantidad proporcional?</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of “reciprocal retirement benefits” for their workers under state law?</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
### PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de &quot;beneficios recíprocos de jubilación&quot; para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por mineros y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 SI</td>
<td>Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>Deberá extirpar la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1989)
**How to Vote on the Votomatic Vote Recorder**

**Special Note:**
If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

**Step 1**
Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

**Using Both Hands**
Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

**Step 2**
Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

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

**Step 3**
Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

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

**Step 4**
After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

**Después de votar,** saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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.

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

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

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. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT — A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS — If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS — The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A — You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

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

Q—How do I register?
A — Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A — Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.” At this election it doesn’t matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A — At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A — Only if you have moved.

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A — Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congress member, State Senator, State Assembly member, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a “yes” or a “no” vote.

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

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A — The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A — Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A — Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

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

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

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A — Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A — Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A — An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A — You must write:
   • your home address,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A — You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comm. College Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BART Board (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M**
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>JUDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor’s, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:


WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of the world’s great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:


DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatas-sio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatas-sio are:

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as a Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW “DADDY” JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy the Manly Citizen. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and business men citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisory campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew “Daddy” Jones

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supa' with you and you wish I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I’ve focused on improving San Francisco’s quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I’m proud of laws I’ve written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I’ve sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Mani, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actually dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.
I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control
I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall’s “Private Club” mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45.
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.
My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.
My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.
As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.
— I’ve developed innovative human services programs for every minority.
— I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.
— I’ve advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.
As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:
— Job training for residents to meet our city’s needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.
— Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.
— Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON
My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City’s best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tattooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

JANET SHIRLEY
My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor’s Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.
Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It’s time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people’s representation in city government. Let’s put a new voice in City Hall.

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Pat Norman
The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Janet Shirley

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

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984. I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Gilman Grant Louie, 332 Union Blvd., Computer Corporation President. Rick Pacurarc, 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. Roland Quan, 407 35th Ave., CPA.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create a pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I will continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"...

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:
  Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win
decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.
  Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care
— not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.
  Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters’ income.
  Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.
  Defend workers’ rights against employers.
  No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity
  against concessions.
  Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. Nancy
G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Mem-
ber. Susan L. Engleand, 3456 17th St., Registered
Nurse. Carl Finamore, 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery
Operator. Alexandra Folger, 298 Fair Oaks St., Law
Office Assistant. Patricia M. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave.,
Secretary. Suzanne L. Forsyth, 77 Cedro Ave., Stu-
dent. May May Gong, 477 Hickory St., Power Plant
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life
Member. Ruth L. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired.
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297 8th St., Retail Clerk.
Victoria Lindsay, 3795 24th St., Professor. Elko P.
Nizuhara, 205 21st Ave., Sales. Esther W. Perry, 3783
20th St., Retired. Hayden H. Perry, 3783 20th St.,
Retired. Joseph Michael Ryan, 1020 Potrero Ave., Ma-
chinist. Ruth E. Schein, One Baker St., Editor.
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Munici-
pal Bus Driver. Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St.,
Muni Driver. Kathyn Setian, 1364 16th Ave., Engi-
neer. Lisa Stiller, 651 Upland Dr., Student. Christine
Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Clerk. David Walters, 190 Col-
lege Ave., Auxiliary Operator. Brian Webster, 795 8th
Ave., Sales Representative. Nancy F. Wohlforth, 737
Burnett Ave., Union Representative. Adam Wood, 190
Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this im-
portant work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at
the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there
still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you
will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of
polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people,
as well as others who are interested in community service are
particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will
be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may
mail in the application form provided below:
(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with
breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please
assign me to a polling place.

Name______________________________
Address__________________________Apt. #____
Telephone No. (required)________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes no
Availability:
  I want to work in the following area(s): __________

Second choice locations (if any)_____________________

Signature__________________________

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop I3.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is — City College and the Centers Division— serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed — on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committee, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committee- man Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
- “Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian.”
- “City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction.”

“Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station’s unplanned parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O’Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinaro.”

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Silvestri are:
Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district’s fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.
During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.
I have always worked for merit appointments and opposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:
- "Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."
- "City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."
- "Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Bircky’s Rochester activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Silvestri are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board; I have:
1) Insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.
2) Helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and
3) Earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and served on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

JULIE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Julie C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

THE SPONSORS FOR JULIE C. ANDERSON ARE:


THE SPONSORS FOR GREG DAY ARE:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francisco, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Uloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.
Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.
Too many children are falling in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic".

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

WILLIAM FELZER

MYRA G. KOPF
My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.
My colleagues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.
Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.
I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

MYRA G. KOPF

GILMAN LOUIE
My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:
Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molino Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximum contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman; Robert Barnes, 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager; Al Borvica, 234 Gates St., Attorney; Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Supervisor; Rev. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board; Willie Lewis Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer; Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress; Agrinipo R. Cebalos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer; Henry Der, 732 32nd Ave., Executive Director; Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco; Naomi T. Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner; Grandval A. Jackson, 257 Kennington Way, President, NAACP; Frederick E. Jordan, 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer; Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWA, Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor; Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director; John L. Molinar, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors; Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor; Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney; Jean-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Union President; Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney; Doris R. Thomas, 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton; Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education; Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent; Arcadius Walker, 143 Gilman Ave., Pastor; Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor; Nauny G. Walker, 355 Green St., Supervisor; Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist; A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmarita Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City’s domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco’s fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City’s fire protection system.

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 Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$46,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$38,808,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$85,008,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-two (22) years would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundredths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate.”

How “A” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot. The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when—the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and visit here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumps can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Proposition A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

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

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter’s Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco’s emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco’s future. Unfortunately, we can’t guarantee another Bayview-type fire won’t happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter’s Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote “Yes” on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litkeiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor’s Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halsestead, Commissioner, Port Commission

Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Solano, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coburn, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco’s neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department’s Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumper’s will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk

Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

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

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco. Proposition A is an important program that will provide Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting throughout the City. When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed “after” the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire...the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition A...fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of “fire protection” water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!
Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection
Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.
John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!
San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a YES vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting. The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.

- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinoso, BART Board candidate

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company

J. M. Enemon, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Vos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Mathews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well.

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

• Yes on Proposition A.
• Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophes. End disregard of public safety.
  — San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water supply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Pozillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Wordegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City’s hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency’s Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City’s general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

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 Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>$145,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirement</td>
<td>$285,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundredths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

“It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously— one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously—but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Proposition B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone
Moscone Center Financing

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioners in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioners.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioners to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioners will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Brit, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America’s convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco’s economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Proposition B will assure the future health of one of our City’s most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let’s protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let’s vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco’s worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don’t expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation’s convention industry.

There’s a lot at stake for San Francisco’s future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect all San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpayers depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city’s economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor’s Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

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

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city’s economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco’s future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation’s convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco’s economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn’t cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city’s livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Wille L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation’s convention and trade show cities.

George’s greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center’s tremendous contribution to our city’s economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation’s most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers. Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose annually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergirding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klopcar
Robert Silvestri

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

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry. We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Magden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGower
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jon Gravani
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want you to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.
This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.
And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.
Proposition B represents $200 million in public financing.
Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—anything.
Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?
Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!
With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.
And Proposition B will delay for at least four years the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?
B is for boondoggle.
Vote NO.
Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hector
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONES CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:
Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Revenue Bond Procedures

PROPOSITION C
Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?  
YES 279  
NO 280

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down after the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds ONLY when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move quickly to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or
(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or
(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; or
(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter; or
(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.
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Open Space; Recreation

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282
NO 283

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

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 approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97
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OPEN SPACE; RECREATION

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher, Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco’s Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco’s children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco’s after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children’s well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women’s Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women’s Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D., Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

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

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children’s future.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

San Francisco’s children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excel. Our children need Proposition D.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Doggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krulow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

Many of the sports world’s greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco’s children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

Children should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco’s children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:
Myra Kaye, President
A. Richard Cerbasi, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denehein
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodornia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children — close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong
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Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco’s children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.
Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.
The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.
The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.
Restoring San Francisco’s after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

Bruce Rafiol, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco’s children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children’s lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elisabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardio Hernandez
Robert G. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tupia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children’s safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won’t cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco’s schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents’ Lobby
John B. Molina
Louise K. Molina
William Coblenz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O’Connor
Mary M. O’Connor
Darrell J. Salamon
E. Porcher Hester
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54
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Provision D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.
Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.
At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.
Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.
Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.
Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.
As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.
In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
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Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

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, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . . DO NOT LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social City employees.

Currently, the City’s pension system allows only a 2% annual employee. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 and have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city’s Retirement System clearly support San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition “E.”

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO S.F. City Employees Credit Union Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Assoc. Laborers International Union #261 Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216 Wendy Nelder Carpenters Local Union #22 Retail Clerks Employees Union #408 Plasterer’s & Shopfitters’ Local #66 Richard D. Hongisto Nancy G. Walker Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921 Office & Professional Employees #3 Willie B. Kennedy Louise Renne

Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers’ Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Jr., Retired State Assemblyman Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int’l Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass’n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass’n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hol Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jr. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Horn, Saita Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflationary economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since PROPOSITION E applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaypee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law? YES 287 ☑ NO 288 ☑

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City’s inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jurisdictions toward an employee’s pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of Proposition F will improve the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees’ Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs’ Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys’ Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees’ Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Probation Officers’ Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators’ Association

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

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees’ Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.
Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees’ Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00 Proposition A — Fire Protection Bonds
2:10 Proposition E — Moscone Center Expansion
2:30 Proposition C — Bond Refinancing
2:35 Proposition D — Playground Funding
2:50 Proposition E — Retirement Pay
2:55 Proposition F — Retirement Benefits
3:00 Proposition G — Union-Time Pension
3:05 Proposition H — Pay Equity
3:20 Proposition I, J — Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30 Proposition K — An Curator
3:35 Proposition M — Planning Issues
3:50 Proposition N — Oil Facilities
PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? YES 290 NO 291

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City’s share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

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 should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union’s members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City’s Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the “normal amount” that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown

Donray Stevens
Robert McCollin
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

Where do ballot arguments come from? Who writes them? Who pays for them? Why are there so many of them? Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

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 and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative “worth”.

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in city employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker’s pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission’s annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of “comparable worth” and “pay equity.” I have refused to support any of them because they favored select City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It’s a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn’t contain phony “meal allowances” or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can’t do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let’s try to correct some historical inequities. Vote “Yes” on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem. Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require. After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year longstanding pay inequities will be corrected.

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact “comparable worth” policies. Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees’ salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities. Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

- In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.
- Proposition H’s moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.
- Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees’ salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees’ pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable. Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That’s why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Superintendent Louise Renne, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative “worth” of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action. Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the longstanding pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau

Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

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

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time. Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carloso Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women’s Political Caucus
Judy Hirschberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents’ Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers’ Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women’s League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Yes on Proposition H. End Bart’s long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions. San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads: “notwithstanding...any provision of any other section of this charter...”

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ≠
NO 297 ≠

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer’s and firefighter’s salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn’t always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer’s and firefighter’s wages until the following year. This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters’ wages in time for San Francisco’s Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your “Yes” vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters’ intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California’s 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It’s about time we corrected this unfair situation. It’s time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker Harry Britt
Bill Maher Carol Ruth Silver
Willie B. Kennedy Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year after the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are deprived of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commissioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, “This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services.” However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the “fair average wage” has often not been given.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition “I” will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the “true” average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition “I” will accomplish this. Proposition “I” is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition “I”.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighters and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Colden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protector

should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire comp-

ensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation’s capital? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history — the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: “This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen.” I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this “off” presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson: “Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!”

(EDITOR’S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.)

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar’s City Hall office.)

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

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?  

YES 302  

NO 303  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemeroski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restaurateur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Wedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections.

Philip Agee, Artist
Paul Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earle-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.

Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Golden Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Panela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsutomo, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by “the Downtown Plan,” which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City’s Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add “Priority Policies” to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county,” known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.
Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced;
2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;
3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;
4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;
5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;
6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;
8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City’s Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 321(a)(1) is amended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.
1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of buildings, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.
(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project (continued on page 103)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close loophole developers, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Roznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weissberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 exist-

ing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Baker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Bath Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppel, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstone, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pucar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shupira, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Teilani, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient; and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people going lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City’s high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan’s loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City’s growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives — higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City’s current development ordinance, and impede this city’s rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers’ loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true economic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco — for greater growth of our city — for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans — for a liveable city

I urge all San Franciscans to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

John Bardin, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws — with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control — as contrasted to the Downtown Plan — which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning — which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Proposition M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

(Organizations listed for identification only)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco’s Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City’s poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colón
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodríguez
Gloria Rodríguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has
— increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;
— increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;
— increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;
— crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;
— sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-tenured neighborhood-serving businesses; and
— made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M’s growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City’s Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M’S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPTHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan’s integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City’s Master Plan. It requires the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you’re getting now.

VOTE YES.
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980-82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan  Gilman Louie
Gordon Chin  Lorraine Lowe
Alton Chinn  Maurice Lim Miller
Cynthia Joe  David Prowler
Clifford Lee  Alicia Wang
Edwin Lee  Chantale Wng
Deborah Lim  Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Larry Beach Becker  Connie Brandon
David Brigode  Robert De Vries
Brian Debohan  Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner  Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz  Jack Judkins
Allison Brennan Kwassik  Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid  Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard  Shirley St. George
Paul Warefield  Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard

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

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford — housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountability can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Bostom
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Finh
Ruth Gravanz
Rayen Hudburgh

Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment — causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-
able housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan — not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City’s ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City’s job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baxton
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty

David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Joe Medina
Dennis Morgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City’s future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan’s growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board’s debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City’s small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco’s economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the interests of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin

Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alano Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Coyote Heights Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighborhoods
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants’ Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Sunset-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

• Better public transit.

• Preserving and building affordable housing.
• Protecting a diverse economic base.
• Preserving neighborhood businesses.
• Preserving landmarks.
• Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darwin Aidaia
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apans & Peter Pursley
Buck Bogat
John Bardi
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner

Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwater
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave

Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Coperti
Zach Cowsen
Stan Crisillos
Ann Crow
Dentie D’Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carlo Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ellia Briccol
Alvin Duskin

Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Enzmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feiser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tilly Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marshia Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavio Gast
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Geldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothy Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hester
Paul Hear
Don Hesla
Jan and Sam Holloway
John Holtsclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh

Daniel Humphrey
Harline Harst
Jerry Hurdado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imperato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jorda
Juan Alama Jelinek
Cynthia Jope
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kayser

Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirstenbaum
Tony Kitroy
Kate Monica Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beaurece Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkin
Lorraine Lowe

Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralph McDonald
Paullette and Robert Hale
McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milaco
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Norm McGowen
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Miglen
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molnare
Jack Moore
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Mosle
Jane McCaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacuriar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Pet
Robert Pender
George Past
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramon
William Renner
Nina Van Renselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riond
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Scharpio
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Artur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Snoed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Strat
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Tauber
Susan Taylor
Paul Tharston
Ellen Trubilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Weirich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What “M” does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if “M” were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M’s clause for “conserving neighborhood character.”

Using another section of the proposition on “conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses,” lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City’s ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled. VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent the conversion of...
Planning Initiative

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost child care facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place
In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a privileged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Proposition M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown child care facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City’s economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

San Francisco’s neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M’s priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the “existing neighborhood character.”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco’s economy.

Our City’s small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M’s priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M’s priority policies will stop small business people from leaving dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don’t let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public’s uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and “take San Francisco back from the developers”. If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco’s future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY

James Haas
Michae Bernick
Mark Buell
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.
San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:
1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will skyrocket.
2. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this “preserving neighborhood character!”

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedence over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!
Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers. San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of “sugar coating” will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Esquivel, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlos del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Coballos, Owner, Coballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

**Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs**

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

**Proposition M Means Lost Revenues**

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

**There is an alternative to Proposition M**

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing
- Developing park and open space areas
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M — Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance

Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church

Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President

Interdenominational Ministers Alliance

Rev. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor

Rev. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church
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I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called “conservationists”, the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities — rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy — small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of Proposition M will stop small business cold.

Proposition M’s priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City’s depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don’t let Proposition M destroy our future.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It’s another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M’s extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City’s General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Atsoga, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant’s Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Domnelly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Etchelbaum, Writer/Restaurateur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demettro Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Sutten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappello
Kenneth Spread, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Amelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youm-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John T. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Currant, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Dickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hornel
Constance C. Hutchison
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemirovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Joe Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamazaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hawai'a Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joanne B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Breck, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny F. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes.

PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammad Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired
Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? YES 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board’s recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay

Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municipal fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges, the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pump suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; the installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

 Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of said election, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil. If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the votes cast on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purpose set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11% per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney
By: Robert A. Konealcy
Deputy City Attorney
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

6413 Open Space Acquisition and Park Renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights therein and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquisition and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining monies shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund. At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquisition as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintenance and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquisition, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at least 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

8.539.1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees: Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of the said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1981. If the member had retired after July 1, 1981, then said monthly increase shall be the amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 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 July 1, 1987.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold faced type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the
The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is intended that this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may pay any reward or any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct.

The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensations paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13 %) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section.

The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest
average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 250,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has a practically fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in those cities included in the certified report of said commission.

The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said index, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 30th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increase schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.
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8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application; examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time; in any case, not exceeding six months; after completion of the probationary period, provided in Section 8.340.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States:

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age or more than 35 years of age at the time of appointment, and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States:

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitled them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H-2 Fireman from List E-25

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position of Class H-2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from List E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of List E-25, Class H-2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559, 10, may retire for service at his or her option.

Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-
ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.555-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his or her option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he or she is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife 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 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his or her 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 or her throughout his or her life, and partly in other benefits payable after his or her death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K
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8.300 Civil Service Positions
(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:
(I) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;
(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of para-professionals and technical instructional assis-
tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order; 

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8400 and 8401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section; 

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission; 

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission; 

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled; 

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art; 

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; 

(7) Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter. 

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter. Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county. 

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted. 

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333. 

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of salary and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employees in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter. 

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate and manage, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall become into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8300(f) and 8450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement. 

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter. 

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time. 

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission. 

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.
reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment and training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(c) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

1. The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

2. The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

103
Application for Absentee Ballot is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM