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Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Woog, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work on Election Day - November 5, 1991 as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic activity.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, November 5, 1991.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

------------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -----------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Initl.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

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 2

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

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

C 第二步 請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步 請把握鍵之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

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。
IMPORTANT NOTICE — “OUT WITH THE GRAY”

For many years, a gray envelope has been provided for two purposes: (1) to cover your ballot, thus keeping it secret, and (2) to give you a place to vote for write-in candidates, by writing their names in the space provided on the envelope.

Starting with this election, the gray secrecy envelope has been replaced by a long card which is attached to your ballot and folds over to cover your entire ballot, thus maintaining the secrecy of your vote. Now you will use the long card to vote for your write-in candidates. Just write in their names in the space provided on the attached card.

Thank you for cooperating with this change to improve the election process.

NEW VOTING BOOTHs!

Shorter lines at your polling places! We now have 6400 voting booths — 1600 more than we had before. This means that there will be more booths in polling places, reducing the waiting time whenever there are a number of people who arrive at the same time to vote.

All parts of the voting booths are made from recycled materials, and can be recycled again. These booths are much less expensive than the booths we previously used — $60 instead of $350 for each one. In addition, they have proven to be sturdy and long lasting by many other cities and counties. Because they are easier to transport and assemble, as well as being easier to maintain, our costs for each election are reduced.

To taxpayers, these booths represent a one-time savings of over $1.5 million and an additional $15,000 – $25,000 each election.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs
___ Lost use of both hands
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair)
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed on October 7. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by October 17, please call 554-4375.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots which are mailed to voters, or given to voters who request them in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots are mailed back to the Registrar or deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall.

ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE (PROPOSITION M) — The Assessor determines how much money a piece of property would probably sell for on the open market. This figure is called the assessed property value. It is used to decide the amount people pay in property tax.

BINDING ARBITRATION (PROPOSITION B) — This happens when two disputing parties agree to have their conflict settled by a neutral third party. The two sides are then legally required to accept that settlement.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

CONDOMINIUM (PROPOSITION N) — A Condominium is an individually owned unit in a multi-unit building, such as an apartment.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS O, P, Q) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITIONS H, J, K, L, M, O, P) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

MEET AND CONFER (PROPOSITIONS C, D) — Before making changes in the terms of employment of City employees, the City must discuss these changes with the affected employee organizations.

MISDEMEANOR (PROPOSITION M) — This is a minor crime or offense that is punishable by a fine and/or a jail sentence of six months or less.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITIONS K, L, M, N) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

PROPOSITION — An issue which voters can vote to decide.

REFERENDUM (PROPOSITIONS L, M) — A law passed by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor does not go into effect for thirty days. If enough voters sign a petition during that thirty days, they can require that the law be placed on the ballot for the voters to approve. If the majority of voters vote “no” on that measure, then it will not become law.

REPEAL (PROPOSITION K) — This means you want to abolish an existing law.

ZONING (PROPOSITION L) — The City is divided into sections for different purposes, such as housing, business, playgrounds, etc., called zoning. Property in an area can only be used for the purpose for which it is zoned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR (ALCALDE) 市長</td>
<td>FRANK M. JORDAN</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JONI JACOBS</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CESAR ASCARRUNZ</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETER PLANTEEN</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEHNERT C. QUEEN</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM HSIEH</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT ATTORNEY (FISCAL) 地方検察官</td>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF (SHERIFF) 縣警長</td>
<td>MICHAEL HENNESSEY</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City's ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?</td>
<td>YES 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>YES 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?</td>
<td>YES 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?</td>
<td>YES 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?</td>
<td>YES 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td>YES 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Si/No</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberá ofrecer la Ciudad incentivos de jubilación temprana durante febrero y marzo de 1992 a fin de reducir la cantidad de empleados, y deberá existir restricciones en las facultades que tiene la Ciudad de reemplazar a algunas de las personas con jubilación temprana hasta el 1 de julio de 1993?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Podrá la Ciudad, en lugar de establecer los sueldos cada año mediante una fórmula, negociar sueldos y beneficios con ciertas organizaciones de empleados de la Ciudad, resolviéndose los desacuerdos por medio de un arbitraje que pudiera ser revocado mediante un voto de 2/3 del Consejo de Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberán eliminarse de la Carta Constitucional ciertos reglamentos de contratación para el Servicio Civil, transfiriéndose los mismos a la Comisión de Servicio Civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se enmenderá la Carta Constitucional a fin de ofrecer los mismos derechos de contratación para todos los postulantes con el mismo puntaje en una lista de servicio civil, y se otorgará a la Comisión de Servicio Civil la autorización de adoptar reglamentos que aumenten el número de postulantes que podrían ser considerados para contratación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Los departamentos de la Ciudad tendrán el derecho de despedir a sus empleados, sujeto a apelación ante un funcionario externo, y tendrá la Ciudad el derecho de aceptar los procedimientos alternativos para el despido de empleados, incluyendo el arbitraje final y valedero?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Podrá el Consejo de Supervisores, cuando así se lo solicite el Alcalde, pagar a los empleados de la Ciudad la diferencia entre su sueldo municipal y su sueldo militar durante 180 días como máximo, mientras estén en servicio activo bajo circunstancias extraordinarias, siempre y cuando se cumplan ciertas condiciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

市府否在二九二二年二月和三月期间减员，公务员提前退休，裁减职员；市府否限制市府否在二九二二年七月一日才能聘用人员替代某些提前退休者？

是否允许市府与某些市员工组织集资购置作为对职工的福利，若有争议则由仲裁解决，但市参议会可以三分二票否决，而非每年应以公式制定薪酬？

是否撤消市章规定某些公务人员的条例以及公序维的管理之下？

是否修正市章以赋予公务人员上具有同等成绩的所有申请人同等雇用权利，市参议公务委员会制定规则，以便在公务名单上增加可能受益的申请人数？

是否允许市府部门解雇职员给与该职员向外界聘请具提出申请，市府是否市否政府同意采取包括有关性的仲裁等个别程序解雇职员？

是否允许市参议会制定措施下给予符合某些条件的在特殊情况下服役的市职员支付特别最多180 日的市薪差和服务薪差的差额？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall Housing Authority police officers be allowed to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor’s Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor’s compensation?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to create a Children’s Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children’s Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a “domestic partnership”?</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>número</td>
<td>sí</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Podrán los oficiales de la policía de Autoridad de Vivienda convertirse en oficiales de policía de San Francisco si cumplen con los requisitos estatales y de la Ciudad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Deberá prohibirse a la Ciudad contratar en nombre del Alcalde a cualquier empleado, incluyendo al asistente del Alcalde, cuyas funciones incluyan la supervisión de cualquier departamento de la Ciudad, y deberá limitarse el sueldo de los empleados de la Oficina del Alcalde hasta un 70% del sueldo del Alcalde?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional a fin de permitir que los residentes de San Francisco menores de 18 años de edad puedan ser nombrados a un consejo, comisión o organismo asesor, en caso de que la ley cree dicho organismo permita tales nombramientos?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Deberá requerirse que la Ciudad establezca un Fondo para la Infancia que será usado sólo para ciertos servicios adicionales para la infancia, reservando cierta cantidad de los ingresos por impuestos a la propiedad en dicho Fondo durante diez años, y deberá requerirse que la Ciudad prepare un Plan Anual de Servicios para la Infancia que establezca los objetivos de dicho Fondo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Deberá revocar la Ciudad la ordenanza que permite que dos adultos no casados y sin vínculo familiar que viven juntos y están de acuerdo en ser responsables conjuntamente de sus gastos básicos de vida establezcan su relación formalmente como “sociedad doméstica”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Se adoptará la ordenanza que cambia la zona del Circuito Phelan ubicado en las calles Ocean y Phelan frente al City College de “P” (Distrito para Uso Público) a “NC-2” (Distrito Comercial de Vecindario de Pequeña Escala)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Se adoptará la ordenanza que cambia la zona del Circuito Phelan ubicado en las calles Ocean y Phelan frente al City College de “P” (Distrito para Uso Público) a “NC-2” (Distrito Comercial de Vecindario de Pequeña Escala)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>número</th>
<th>sí</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the City’s rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td>YES 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?</td>
<td>YES 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City’s unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression?</td>
<td>YES 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?</td>
<td>YES 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified health and social welfare services and programs?</td>
<td>YES 151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES MUNICIPALES, 5 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1991**

**MEDIDAS PRESENTADAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y EL CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132 SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará el control de alquileres de la Ciudad a fin de limitar la cantidad que un dueño pueda cobrarle a un inquilino nuevo hasta un máximo del 10% al 14% mayor que el alquiler pagado por el inquilino anterior, siempre y cuando el dueño pudiera recibir un aumento adicional en caso de cumplirse ciertas condiciones?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>應否修正市政府的房租管制法令，限制房东向新住客所收房租不得超过前住客所付房租的10%至14%，但如果符合一定条件，房东可以加租？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la ley de la Ciudad que limita el tipo de edificios y la cantidad de unidades (200 anualmente) que puedan convertirse a condominios a fin de crear un procedimiento paralelo que hace que todos los edificios de alquiler residencial puedan convertirse a condominios sin limite anual y sin tener en cuenta las demás restricciones de la ley actual, siempre y cuando por lo menos el 51% de los inquilinos aprueben esta conversión, el dueño del edificio proporcione el 90% del financiamiento, el inquilino tenga la primera opción de comprar la unidad al 75% de su valor de mercado y se cumplan con otras condiciones?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>應否修正市法例，使原限制某類樓宇和單位數目（每 年200單位）合格改建為共寮公寓可訂立並行程序法使所有住宅出租樓房均合格改建為共寮公 寓而免於年度限制，並不受現有法律 的某些限制，如果獲得至少51%住客 的書面同意，房東能負90%資金， 住客有優先權以市值75 %的價格購 買單位，所有不願購買的住客有權延 續長期租住，除非是合法追遷，以及 符合其他一些條件？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco confirmar el apoyo incondicional de la Ciudad ante el derecho de libertad de expresión delineado en la Primera Enmienda?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>肯定本市無條件支持第一修正案的言論自由權應否成爲舊金山人民的一項政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco recomendar que el Estado de California y la Asociación Médica de California vuelvan a permitir las medicinas de cáñamo en su lista de medicamentos disponibles?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>建議加州政府和加州醫學會恢復大麻 療劑為可使用的藥物應否成爲舊金 山人民的一項政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco que el gobierno federal reduzca el presupuesto militar en un 10% anual durante los siguientes 5 años, utilizando los ahorrós a fin de mejorar ciertos servicios y programas específicos de salud y bienestar social?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>要求聯邦政府在未來五年每年削減軍 費10 % 並把省下來的錢更好地提供 特定的衛生保健和社會福利服務計劃 應否成爲舊金山人民的一項政策？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**

選舉完畢

一九九一年十一月五日舊金山市選舉 提交選民投票公決的提案 市縣提案
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before October 8, 1991

Q — I moved on or before October 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after October 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between October 8 and November 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — You can vote for:
Mayor, District Attorney and Sheriff.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, November 5, 1991. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

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.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you. You may wish to take the Voter’s Quick Reference Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before November 5 if you:
• Fill out and mail in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. You will be sent an absentee ballot within three days after we receive your request. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall, Room 158 from October 7 through November 5. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November 2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 5.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include: your home address, the address to which you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from October 7 through November 5. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November 2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 5. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed on page 5 of this pamphlet may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 1528 Fillmore Street produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

MAYOR
The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City and County of San Francisco. The term of office for the Mayor is four years. The Mayor is paid $129,090 a year.

SHERIFF
The Sheriff runs the county jails and provides bailiffs (security) for the courts. The term of office for the Sheriff is four years. The Sheriff is paid $93,886 a year.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
The District Attorney prosecutes criminal court cases for the City and County of San Francisco. The term of office for District Attorney is four years. The District Attorney is paid $116,584 a year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Mayor

ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 1930 Hyde Street
My occupation is Party of Life, Leader
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I have made no deals or commitments to any "Special Interest" nor will I. As Mayor I will proudly declare for all to hear that my employer is all the people of San Francisco — Democrats, Republicans, and Independents — of every neighborhood, of every economic group and every community. If hard work, dedication, and devotion to the office of Mayor will make San Francisco a better city, I will give it everything I have. It is from the people that the proud spirit of "I Will" springs. It is with the people that this spirit resides, spurring all of us to greater effort.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

TOM HSIEH

My address is 1151 Taylor Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: I want to make San Francisco world-class again. But it will take vision and guts to restore our economic health. Like the historic retirement program I created to trim the City’s payroll — without layoffs or cutting services — saving $25 – 35 million a year.

My blueprint for San Francisco is based on 5 common-sense themes...

- A Safe City ... with adequate law enforcement.
- A Clean City ... to live and work in.
- A Competitive City ... with a balanced budget and healthy economy.
- A Liveable City ... with services for families and the elderly.
- A Fair City ... with respect and equality for everyone.

Tom Hsieh

The sponsors for Tom Hsieh are:
Candidates for Mayor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: I have the most extensive executive management experience of any mayoral candidate.
   It must be management that serves all of San Francisco: environmentalists; all of our neighborhoods and movements; African Americans; Asians; gays and lesbians; Latinos and women.
   As Sheriff of San Francisco, I dramatically and progressively reformed the department and proved I can turn around a City.
   I am the only candidate with a proven track record as Sheriff, Supervisor and Assessor.
   Because of my record, I have received the endorsement of N.O.W.; the major gay and lesbian organizations; many Democratic clubs; and neighborhood leaders.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:
Carlota Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, School Board Member.
Michael S. Bernick, 3961 Sacramento St., BART Director. Libby
Denehim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., SF School Board Member. Ruth
Brinker, 336 Moultrie St., Founder, Project Open Hand. Thomas C.
Fleming, 1727 Fillmore St., #314, Editor, Sun Reporter. Del Martin,
651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer. Louis H. Lee, 1 Daniel Burnham
Ct., #105, Lawyer. Douglas L. Comstock, 610 22nd St., #253, Artist.
Espanola Jackson, 3231 Ingalls, Homemaker/Community Activist.
John Bairdis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Former San Francisco Supervisor.
Ksenia Tzenin, 637 Steiner, Attorney. Alan D. Weaver, 1070 Haight
St., Environmentalist. Nadine Safadi, 125 Crespi Dr., Community
Activist. Richmond Young, 16 Ord Ct., #2, Editor/President, Stone
Wall Club. Daniel J. Addario, 950 Columbus Ave., #16, Former
Special Agent, Drug Enforcement Agency. Phyllis A. Lyon, 651
Duncan St., Author/Educator. Jesse D. Wall, 225 Edna, Physics
Professor. James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Supervi
sor. Barbara J. Thomson, 40 Gladys St., Coordinator – Employ
ment Affirmative Action. Adrian M. Bermudez, Jr., 1350 Geneva
Ave., Environmental Health. Hadle Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Senior
Investigator, District Attorney’s Office. Joyce D. Aldana, 1299
Lombard, #41, Businesswoman. Jewel Green, 131 Middle Point Rd.,
Vice President, Hunters View Resident Management Council. Roger
Cardenas, 34 Liberty St., #2, Businessperson. Margaret A. Verges,
3041 Pine St., Counselor/Neighborhood Activist. Troy H.
Dangerfield, 235 Westgate Dr., Retired Police Officer. Salvador
Garza, 795 Brunswick, Self-Employed. Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159
42nd Ave., Parliamentarian. Francis J. Claus, 437 Pennsylvania
Ave., Author/Publisher. John E. Wahl, 65 Hermann St., #3, Lawyer.

DEHNERT C. QUEEN

My address is 956 Sacramento Street, Apt. 305
My occupation is CEO, Small Business Development Company
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco’s past and present incumbents act to enhance only THEIR future -- NOT the people who pay their wages.
   I’ve proven Mission Bay, Waterfront, transit plans:
   • Will increase cost-of-living $282/month/resident!
   • Transit extensions will be obsolete upon completion (year 2000)!
   • $7.3 BILLION BEING MISUSED AGAINST US!
My plans create:
   • PRIVATELY-FUNDED Worldwide Business Gateway -
   housing, ballpark, commerce, SKILLED jobs. I raised needed
   $625 million!
   • INTEGRATED transit — CalTrain/Metro constructed in
   THREE, not eleven years.
   • SAVES TAXPAYERS $2.7 BILLION!
   My Committee Against Mission Bay PREVAILED (1990)!
   BUT, Agnos, Alioto, Hongisto, Hsieh have quietly formalized
   Agnos’ plans ADMINISTRATIVELY!
Want More? ASK!
VOTE!

Dehnert C. Queen

The sponsors for Dehnert C. Queen are:
Wm. Scott Hepburn, 353 Rivera St., Student. Glenn H. Kobuchi,
2058 23rd Ave., Travel Agency. Kenneth Cresel, 1567 42nd Ave.,
Motorcycle Shop Owner. Karen Dehnert, 2384 29th Ave., Book-
binder. Richard A. Rehl, 775 Post St., Manager. Mary K. Kovac,
1594 46th Ave., Retired. Ruth Wilhelmsen, 1522 11th Ave., Sales-
person. Esther E. Dehnert, 2384 29th Ave., Salesperson. Letty M.
McGewan, 1789 Oak St., Loft, Sales. Helinz J. Winslow, 3936
Noriega St., Printer. Donna M. Yuraske, 33 Child St., Insurance
Broker. Charles T. Enders, 2065California St. #101, Opera
Singer/Chorus. Corinella J. Monroe, Jr., 2065 California St. #101,
Broadcast Business Manager. Albert Haas, 8 Locksley Ave. 10B,
Retired. Joseph M. Blank, 2035 Castro St. #21, Management
Consultant. Lex E. Fukumitsu, 1025 Powell St. #36, Food & Beverage
Director. Nina E. Rudolph, 956 Sacramento St. #302, Retired. Hazel J.
Best, 956 Sacramento St. Apt. 403, Retired. Phyllis L. Ellis, 956
Sacramento St. #405, Retired. Melody L. Lacy, 1314A Kearny St.,
Copier Service Person. Joel Timothy, 650 Grand Ave. #3,
Musician-Songwriter. Linda D. Ward, 1304 11th Ave., Cocktail
Server. Judy L. Wong, 18 Berkeley Way, Educator. Heather Lay,
1314A Kearny St., Production Coordinator.

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

GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA

My address is 3207 Mission St. #9
My occupation is Union newspaper printer
My qualifications for office are: People's needs first, not profits. Housing, healthcare, AIDS funding, jobs, schools, transit, libraries, comprehensive senior services, youth programs, arts, environmental protection, earthquake safety, substance abuse programs, childcare, should be guaranteed rights. Fund programs by taxing large corporations' profits. Oppose racism, sexism, homophobia, AIDS discrimination, police brutality. Strengthen affirmative action. Defend union rights. Affordable housing must be a right! Build housing, use Presidio, freeze rents, real vacancy control. Defend reproductive rights. Embargo South Africa. Support Palestinian national rights. Oppose military spending, war. Ultimately, we need socialism, based on people's needs, not profits.

Gloria Estela La Riva

The sponsors for Gloria Estela La Riva are:

PETER PLANTEEN

My address is 1060 Powell St. #32
My occupation is Men's Clothing Store Owner
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: I am a small but successful businessman who would run the City of San Francisco, exactly the way I've ran my business.

I would bring imagination and a hands on policy on every issue. My experience dealing with people all of my adult life will help me find solutions out of problems and then solve these problems.

I have never held political office before, but I do not consider that a liability. In fact, I consider that an asset, because I will bring my businessman's mentality to City Hall and offer a fresh and logical approach to city government.

Peter Planteen

The sponsors for Peter Planteen are:
Candidates for Mayor

CESAR ASCARRUNZ

My address is 3140 Mission Street
My occupation is businessman
My qualifications for office are: I have been a successful businessman in San Francisco for the past 30 years. I have proven business management skills with a strong academic background.
Over the past 10 years I have been active in benefits for integration teachers and education, gay, lesbian and woman rights, hispanic pride, the homeless and the environment.
I have been an advisor for business and cultural affairs as a member of multiple community organizations which have earned me the unofficial title of Mayor of the Mission District.

Cesar Ascarrunz

The sponsors for Cesar Ascarrunz are:

ART AGNOS

My address is 106 Dorchester Street
My occupation is Mayor of San Francisco
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: The job of government is to be a friend to those who would be vulnerable without it: any of us can find ourselves powerless, any worthy concern can start out friendless.
As Mayor, I’ve championed our city’s earthquake recovery from full Red Cross relief to reassuring convention planners and building our emergency response. I’ve won new AIDS funding, increased child care, implemented Prop M, and an expanding mass transit.
We’re opening the waterfront by tearing down the Embarcadero Freeway, we’re opening opportunity by building affordable housing and vacation control and we’ve opened government to all. I respectfully offer my candidacy.

Art Agnos

The sponsors for Art Agnos are:

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

**ANGELA ALIOTO**

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a native San Franciscan and mother of four, I cannot tolerate seeing San Francisco turned into a dull, harsh place.

Our City’s health is in jeopardy as City Hall closes human services, ignores dirty streets, lets MUNI deteriorate and forces businesses to flee.

As your Supervisor, I’ve worked to preserve effective programs that:
- care for the mentally ill
- provide shelter for abused women and children
- prevent AIDS through education and intervention
- provide mobility to seniors.

With new leadership in the Mayor’s office, a change of priorities, and some Alioto energy, we can restore health to the City we all love.

*Angela Alioto*

The sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

**JONI JACOBS**

My address is 774 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Socialist Action Pro-choice Activist
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: My program that says human needs are human rights:
- Funded abortion rights and child care.
- House the homeless.
- Free health care for all, including people with AIDS.
- Quality public education — no teacher layoffs or cutbacks!
- Union scale for workers on city contracts — no wage freezes!
- Union-scale job training for youth and unemployed workers.
- End police brutality against minorities and gays; Black community control of police.
- Tax the rich and corporations to fund human needs — no regressive taxes!
- No money for war or prison construction!

The bosses have two parties. Workers need a labor party to represent them.

Vote Socialist Action!

*Joni Jacobs*

The sponsors for Joni Jacobs are:
Candidates for Mayor

FRANK M. JORDAN

My address is 3350 Laguna Street, #101
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans have had sand kicked in their faces by the bully in the Mayor's office. Does Art Agnos work only for himself, or for you? I've worked for San Franciscans for 33 years — building over 1,000 SAFE neighborhood blockclubs and starting our Senior Escort Program. As Chief, I founded our Hate Crimes Unit and the school anti-drug program. I fought to integrate the SFPD, appointing the highest-ranking Black, Latino, Asian and Women officers and actively recruiting Lesbians and Gays.

As Mayor, I will ban Agnos' Deputy Mayors and audit every department eliminating waste. Make San Francisco work for you.

Frank M. Jordan

The sponsors for Frank M. Jordan are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., State Senator/Attorney.

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for
District Attorney

ARLO SMITH

My address is 66 San Fernando Way
My occupation is District Attorney of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: I'm very proud of what my
office has accomplished since I've been San Francisco's D.A.
Among our many achievements:
- An award-winning Hate Crimes Unit that was California's first;
- A Drug Strike Force targeting upper-level drug dealers that's
achieved a conviction rate of 95%;
- A Consumer/Environmental Protection Unit that's one of the
best and most effective in California;
- A Family Support Bureau collecting some $17 million annually
for 15,000 dependent children in San Francisco;
- A Domestic Violence Unit that's a nationwide model.
I ask for your vote to continue to serve San Francisco.

Arlo Smith

The sponsors for Arlo Smith are:
Joseph L. Alloto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Lawyer, Former Mayor of San Francisco.

Candidate for
Sheriff

MICHAEL HENNESSEY

My address is 261 Anderson Street
My occupation is Sheriff of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: As Sheriff, I have kept my
promise to restore safety and security to the jails. I have signifi-
cantly improved training for deputy sheriffs and have instituted
nationally acclaimed county jail prisoner education and vocational
programs.
I have also kept my promise to bring women and minorities into
top management and to create a permanent program to assist
senior and disabled citizens facing eviction.
My pledge to you is a Sheriff’s Department dedicated to equal
justice and compassion for all San Franciscans.
Your strong support recognizes our past achievements and
provides the foundation for continuing progress.
Thanks for your support.

Michael Hennessey

The sponsors for Michael Hennessey are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against the measures. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None have been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent’s" and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure and one argument against the measure are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge. These arguments are called the “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument.”

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” only indicates that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”:

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”:

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed following the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments which will be published in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

Paid arguments are printed following the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order, but are arranged to make the most efficient use of each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. They are printed as submitted. No corrections are made to spelling and/or grammatical errors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Early Retirement

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City's ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?

YES \[\rightarrow\] NO \[\rightarrow\]

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees may retire at age 50 if they have worked for 20 years or at age 60 if they have worked for 10 years. Generally, an employee's pension increases with the number of years worked, the employee's age and salary. Once a retired employee leaves the payroll, the City may fill the position immediately.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A is a charter amendment to encourage employees (other than firefighters, police officers, and those in the state retirement system) to retire early. For retirement purposes, qualified employees would be treated as if they had worked three years longer and were three years older. This would allow some employees to retire who are not now eligible. Also, it would increase the retirement pay of employees who are already eligible to retire. Employees would have to retire on or after February 1, 1992 and before March 31, 1992 to qualify under this measure.

Proposition A would require that certain jobs left vacant by early retirement be eliminated. A committee made up of the Mayor, Controller and General Manager of Personnel would recommend which jobs to eliminate. Two persons chosen by the San Francisco Labor Council would serve as advisory members. First, the committee would decide which jobs could not be eliminated. Under Proposition A these include: City officers, jobs producing money for the City, jobs paid for by money the City receives from state or federal government, jobs vital to public health, safety and transit, and jobs required by law.

Second, the committee would recommend which of the remaining vacant positions to eliminate. The Mayor would have to eliminate 500 or 50% of those jobs, whichever is more. The jobs would be eliminated from the budget until July 1993 unless the Mayor recommends filling the jobs and 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors agree.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could result in a net savings of approximately $20.5 million in fiscal 1992-93 and similar savings could recur in subsequent years. This is due to a projected increase in the cost of the City’s Retirement System of approximately $4.5 million in 1992-93, offset by an estimated $25 million in salary savings from positions vacated through early retirement.

Based on estimates from the Retirement System, approximately 1500 employees might accept the provisions of this measure and vacate their positions. The amendment sets a minimum of 500 or 50% of the vacated positions to be removed from the budget in 1992-93, but allows the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to add back positions by a two-thirds vote. If 500 positions are removed, salary and fringe benefit savings of approximately $25 million per year could result. The actual savings may vary depending on the number of early retirees, their respective salary levels and the number of positions and length of time they are held vacant.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 31, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, and Carole Migden.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Early Retirement

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Early Retirement charter amendment is a win-win proposition for San Francisco. The City will reward its long-time employees and at the same time save millions of dollars. This is a sensible way to pare down the City's payroll.

Proposition A will save between $25 and $37 million a year for San Francisco. That's money that we can direct towards critically needed programs and services for our neighborhoods, our children, the homeless and all San Francisco residents.

Reducing the City's payroll through this Early Retirement program will help the City live within its means. Proposition A requires that a minimum of 500 positions be eliminated from the City budget.

A yes vote is a vote to offer a golden handshake to those who have provided long-term service to our city. Employees who are eligible to retire early will receive their full pension benefits.

We will then be able to eliminate positions that are non-essential for the provision of city services. And we will not lay off any workers! Everyone in San Francisco will be a winner if you vote yes on Proposition A!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez and Migden.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

City government needs reforming.
In 1985, I publicly warned officials about the fiscal chaos the City would experience unless decisive changes were made in management and finance practices.
Those changes never came and San Francisco has been riddled with debt and mismanagement since.
Proposition A contributes to reform. It lets City workers with lengthy service take early retirement. Minimally, 500 voluntary vacancies will be created. These non-essential slots cannot be refilled by the mayor. There are no forced layoffs.
This measure saves San Francisco $25 million annually. Still pressing is the need to reorganize our 66 departments. My campaign has laid out a comprehensive plan to restructure City government.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

---

As the author of Proposition A, I urge you to support this measure. Your yes vote will help restore fiscal responsibility to City Hall. In recent years we have let the size and cost of government spiral out of control, but now we have a chance to reverse that trend.
This measure will eliminate 500 non-essential positions without layoffs and create a $25 to $37 million annual savings, all without reducing services! Savings can be used to improve local programs. San Francisco will become a competitive and liveable city again.
Raising fees and taxes is not the only way to create revenues. It is time to bring common sense to our fiscal policies. I urge you to vote for Proposition A so we can take the first step!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

---

I advocate a “yes” vote. Measure A reduces city employment by offering long-term employees early retirement. The savings would be $20.5 million. Essential city services will be protected because no police or firefighter positions will be left vacant under Proposition A.

Mayor Art Agnos

---

Rarely can voters cut the cost and size of government and provide funding for necessary programs with one vote, but Proposition A provides that opportunity.
Proposition A provides an incentive for City employees to leave their employment thru an early retirement program, reducing jobs without the need to lay off workers. Savings can be used for needed services and programs or to reduce the cost of government.
Proposition A commits the City to reduce its payroll, abolishing at least 500 positions vacated by those who retire.
Business and Labor urge you to join them in voting Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
Stan Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Stephen Cornell, Past President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

---

Question — Is it possible to develop a major job reduction, cost saving program without causing layoffs of City employees who have given loyal service to San Francisco citizens?
Proposition A provides a positive answer to the aforementioned question and serves as proof that Business, Labor and City Government can work together to develop an early retirement program that reduces jobs while at the same time preventing lay-offs. Proposition A also commits the City to reduce on-going pay roll costs by not replacing 500 workers who retire early at a cost savings of 20 million dollars.
The San Francisco Labor Council strongly urges a yes vote on Proposition A, which is truly a win-win situation for all San Franciscans.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition A

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 thereto, providing for early service retirement.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.517-2 EARLY SERVICE RETIREMENT

(a) The retirement board shall provide an incentive for members under sections 8.509 and 8.584 to retire early for service by increasing the member's age and credited service for both qualification and benefit computation purposes by three (3) years.

This early retirement incentive shall apply only to members who retire from service with an effective date of retirement on or after February 1, 1992 and prior to March 31, 1992. This benefit increase will not apply to a vesting retirement.

(b) No later than April 1, 1992, the retirement board shall assemble and transmit to the Mayor's office a list of all positions vacated as a result of early retirement incentive created by this section. Immediately thereafter, the Mayor shall convene a review committee consisting of the Mayor, Controller, and the General Manager, Personnel, or their designees and two labor representatives appointed by the San Francisco Labor Council who shall serve as advisory members of the committee. That committee shall review all positions identified in the aforementioned list for the purpose of determining which positions must be filled ("mandated positions") according to any one of the following criteria:

(1) positions designated as officers by Section 1.103 of this charter;
(2) positions determined to be vital to public safety or the delivery of health and transit services;
(3) positions which the city is under a legal duty to fill pursuant to consent decree, memorandum of understanding in effect prior to August 1, 1991, contract, state or federal law, court decision, or other legal requirements;
(4) positions that produce revenues or reimbursements to the city or positions funded substantially through enterprise funds or funds provided to the city through grants, or state or federal reimbursements or bond proceeds.

Thereafter, the review committee shall calculate the number of non-mandated positions that were vacated. The committee shall review each non-mandated position and make a recommendation as to which positions should be abolished. In order to maximize the cost savings benefits of early retirement, the review committee shall give special attention to reviewing those positions with salaries in excess of $60,000.

The Mayor shall receive and review the recommendations of the review committee and thereafter is authorized and directed to abolish in the 1991-92 fiscal year budget at least 500 or 50% of the vacated, non-mandated positions on the list, whichever is greater. The Mayor shall effect that abolition by transmitting a communication to the controller and the Board of Supervisors identifying the positions that have been abolished. In addition, the City shall abolish the same positions in the fiscal year 1992-93 budget and salary ordinance. It is not the intent of this section that work performed by such abolished positions shall be contracted out.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned abolition of positions, upon the recommendation of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, by a two-thirds vote, may restore to the 1991-92 budget or place in the 1992-93 budget any of the aforementioned non-mandated positions.

(c) The early retirement benefits offered under this section shall not be interpreted to apply to the provisions of Charter Sections 8.509(f) and 8.584-6. The early retirement benefits under this section shall be limited by the maximum percentage limitations in Charter Sections 8.509(b) and 8.584-2.

The early retirement benefits under this section will be limited by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and no early retirement benefits under this section will be effective if they have an adverse effect on the tax qualified status of the retirement system under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Proposition B

Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The wages of most City employees are set each year based only on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Benefits such as dental care and vacation can only be added or changed with voter approval. Other terms of employment, such as uniform allowances, are negotiated with employee organizations through collective bargaining.

The Proposal: Proposition B is a charter amendment that would allow employee organizations representing most City workers to negotiate wages, hours, benefits and other working conditions through collective bargaining. Employee organizations would have a choice of this extension of collective bargaining or having their terms of employment set as they are now. The decision by an employee organization to choose collective bargaining would be permanent.

If parties could not reach agreement through collective bargaining, each side would submit a final offer on disputed issues to an arbitration board. The arbitrators would choose either the City’s or employee organization’s entire offer without change. The arbitrators must consider the cost of living, wages and benefits paid elsewhere, the City’s financial situation and other factors. The arbitrators’ decision could be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, which could choose the other side’s final offer by a 2/3 vote.

For employees not represented by an employee organization, terms of employment would be set by the Mayor subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition B would not affect the civil service provisions on hiring and promotions. Generally, the way retirement benefits are set would not change.

As a result of previous negotiations of various issues including a wage freeze, if Proposition B passes a majority of City workers will get dental coverage.

A “Yes” Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “No” Vote Means: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

The proposed Charter amendment allows employee unions representing approximately 24,000 City, School District and Community College miscellaneous (non-teaching) employees the option to either negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, or to remain under existing formulae which set salaries by a survey of local employers and require voter approval to change benefits and working conditions. As a product of the application of this change, the cost of government could increase or decrease, depending on the outcome of future negotiations and arbitration awards.

Any change in the manner of setting salary and fringe benefit rates can have a substantial effect on the cost of City government since total salary and fringe benefit costs for the employees potentially affected by this charter amendment amount to slightly less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Also, in my opinion, costs for negotiation, grievance and arbitration services will increase in a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount.

Additionally, this amendment would allow provisions of current memoranda of understanding with some affected employee organizations to take effect. These memoranda provide:

• The City will allow certain employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992-93;
• A dental plan will be adopted effective April 1, 1992, estimated to cost $13 million per year;
• Unions agree not to contest in court the 1991-92 salary freeze which avoided approximately $62 million in salary and benefit costs;
• City will adopt 1992-93 salary rates using existing formulae.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPPOSITION B IS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE REFORM SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS NOW.

Present economic realities call for re-forming City employee salary setting standards, providing fiscal checks for the City and flexibility for City workers. This year, the City saved $62 million, crucial to balancing the budget, as a result of City employees foregoing scheduled salary increases.

The current system for setting City employee salaries locks the City into yearly automatic salary formulas and pay increases. Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State.

Most importantly, Proposition B requires evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and ability to pay BEFORE setting wages and benefits for City workers.

- Proposition B allows for negotiation of wages and benefits for City and County employees.
- Proposition B will eliminate the automatic employee pay raises which increase the City’s annual budget.
- Proposition B requires binding arbitration for peaceful resolution of labor disputes.
- Health insurance is such a basic necessity but many City employee families don’t have adequate coverage. Proposition B allows City employees to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

VOTE YES on Proposition B to provide a fair, impartial, and fiscally responsible way to determine wages, health benefits and working conditions for City employees.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, former Police Chief Al Nelder, Rev. James McCray, School Board members Tom Ammiano and Carlota del Portillo, Community College Governing Board President Mabel Teng, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco Police Officers Association, the San Francisco Firefighters, and the Central Labor Council urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Behind the lofty words in Proposition B are the self-interests of the powerful political establishment in San Francisco. Proposition B will turn city unions into franchises to collect dues — but city workers will have no rights. Big Brother “arbitrators” will make all the important decisions.

Proposition B blurs the divergent interests of management and workers and erodes the basis of independent worker organization. Its purpose is to inhibit the ability of city workers to take defensive action.

Proposition B sets up a vertical, bureaucratic structure with no room for democratic participation. Proposition B hides with obscure, legal wording an anti-democratic viewpoint: negotiations behind closed doors, appointed highly paid arbitrators, extra pay for favored city bureaucrats. Thus it institutionalizes bureaucratic social control over city workers.

City workers have had to suffer through two wage freezes with no recourse to strike action. The Chamber of Commerce and its political friends are supporting Proposition B clearly in order to impose a third wage freeze. City workers have become the scapegoats for inefficient top-heavy city management and the failure of the established political structure to present any solutions to our social problems. This process of disempowerment ensures that workers and tax payers will be further denied a voice about their jobs and city services.

STOP BIG BROTHER CONTROL!
FOR REAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING!
NO ON B!

City Workers for Real Unionism
Earl Gilman

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

City workers need real collective bargaining. But Proposition B sets up compulsory arbitration — the opposite of collective bargaining. Though Proposition B contains a few “carrots” for workers, it is basically a “stick” which hands complete power over wages and fringes to a three person board of arbitrators. They are appointees — not democratically elected. Moreover, there is no mention in Proposition B how or when these arbitrators can be removed. City workers will be at the mercy of the “board.” It is naive to assume this board — though claiming impartiality — will not be influenced by political pressure. In fact, the third person on this board — the tie breaking vote — will be one of the most powerful people in San Francisco.

Proposition B allows the board to meet “privately,” which really means secretly, thus allowing for deals behind the backs of union members. Also hidden in the wording of Proposition B are special financial “incentives” for individual managers, who are already very well paid. Favoritism is almost inevitable, because Proposition B contains no controls on these pay-offs.

City unions will inevitably become appendages of the “board.” In the Soviet Union workers once had unions like this — controlled by the state — but these workers now are demanding real unions including the right to strike.

Why are we going backwards in San Francisco while in the Soviet Union and other countries workers are demanding their rights? Many unions, unfortunately, have become businesses collecting dues from members and are no longer interested in organizing the unorganized. Under Proposition B, unions won’t have to organize. Workers turn cynical and apathetic when wages are frozen and hiring freezes result in speed-up. Proposition B will reinforce this process with the result of turning our unions into company unions.

CITY WORKERS FOR REAL UNIONISM
Earl Gilman, Secretary

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a well-conceived, thoughtfully drafted reform. It is the result of hundreds of hours of negotiation and careful consideration.

Proposition B is fair to both the City as well as City workers.

Proposition B will allow the City to consider the overall budget picture rather than be locked into automatic salary pay increases and formulas. This will provide more flexibility in the budgetary process, and will assist in the maintenance of vital City services.

Proposition B will preclude strikes through the use of the peaceful method of arbitration.

Under Proposition B, City workers will be allowed to negotiate for salaries and health benefits, just like employees in the private sector.

A Yes Vote on Proposition B will help modernize an outdated salary setting system and will provide fiscally responsible reform.

Vote Yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will reform the city’s current salary setting process by allowing employees to negotiate for wages and benefits.

Your Yes vote on Proposition B, will insure that wage increases for city workers will be based upon the city’s ability to pay, not a rigid salary survey.

Proposition B requires that disputes be resolved by arbitration, not strikes. Charter prohibitions against strikes remain unchanged.

Proposition B provides a fair, impartial and fiscally responsible way to fix salaries and benefits.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Donald D. Doyle, President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Sonia Melara, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Harold M. Hoogasian, President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
James D. Jefferson, Past President, San Francisco Black Chamber of Commerce

Proposition B solves two of the City’s major problems by creating a much needed expansion of the collective bargaining process to include wage and benefits. In addition, Proposition B provides a one year wage freeze which will help resolve the City’s serious financial short-fall. In truth Proposition B is a “bridge over troubled waters”. A bridge constructed through the efforts of both City employees and City Government.

For far too long, San Francisco’s workers have been denied true collective bargaining.

Proposition B provides a choice for San Francisco Labor Unions to enter into the new collective bargaining program or to remain under the present formula system. Proposition B also saves the City at least 62 million dollars by acceptance of the wage freeze.

The Proposition B bridge was built through the tireless efforts of concerned citizens who are looking to a financially secure future while giving consideration to the basic rights of all citizens.

Approval of Proposition B will protect citizens from the flow of turbulent deficit waters. San Francisco voters have the power to place the last and most important piece in the bridge by voting Yes on Proposition B.

The San Francisco Labor Council strongly recommends a Yes vote on Proposition B.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition B. Today’s workforce has more women and more minorities, but our Charter locks in a system created when that wasn’t true. New issues important to today’s workers — child care, dental care, dependent health care, disability pay — shouldn’t be kept off the bargaining table because we locked in a system that reflected yesterday’s workforce issues. This measure recognizes the right of today’s workers to bargain for today’s needs.

Mayor Art Agnos

PROPOSITION B IS SOUND FISCAL REFORM

Proposition B is based on sound economic benefits to the City and to San Francisco taxpayers.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Presently, the City uses formulas and the combined salaries of what other Bay Area City’s pay their employees to set City employee wages. This locks the City in to pay increases regardless of the overall financial climate.

Proposition B places a provision in the City Charter that is badly needed, the provision that will require evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and it’s ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers.

With this safeguard, Proposition B creates a balanced salary setting plan for City and County workers. It gives City and County workers the ability to negotiate for an equitable wage and benefit plan and it provides fiscal checks and balances for the City.

Allowing City workers the ability to negotiate their salaries and benefits is a better way to do business than the “take it or leave it” approach that often results in strikes and conflicts.

Rigid salary formulas for all city workers drive annual increases far beyond the City’s ability to pay and have added tens of millions of dollars in needless expense to the City Budget. Proposition B will enable the City to hold the line on salaries.

To insure that the City’s employee salary setting standards remain on solid economic footing in the years to come, I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Louis J. Giraudo
President, San Francisco Bread Co.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B BRINGS FAIRNESS TO SAN FRANCISCO LABOR RELATIONS

We support Proposition B because it represents a fair and equitable form of labor relations for City workers.

Collective bargaining and binding arbitration are basic labor issues. Proposition B changes the current City employee salary setting standards to provide greater flexibility for City workers and their families.

Proposition B will provide, for the first time, the ability for City workers to negotiate for health benefits for their families. This is a basic necessity whose time has come.

**WE URGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.**

Strikes will be precluded, since Proposition B utilizes the peaceful method of arbitration to settle grievances and grievances.

Proposition B will bring San Francisco in line with other Bay Area cities and counties who already allow their workers to negotiate through collective bargaining and binding arbitration.

For fairness, equity, and flexibility, we urge you to support Proposition B.

**VOTE YES ON PROP B.**

San Francisco Labor Council
SEIU, Local 790
SEIU, Local 250
S.F. Firefighters
San Francisco Police Officers Association

---

**Proposition B is reasonable and responsible change worthy of your support and your vote.**

Proposition B changes the current system for setting salaries that mandates automatic salary formulas and pay increases and provides for collective bargaining, the process by which the City and City employees will be able to negotiate wage and health benefits. Isn’t it only fair for City employees to have the same right to negotiate wages and health benefits that exists in the private sector?

Proposition B is a sensible plan that will preclude strikes.

Proposition B is fiscally responsible reform. It has safeguards to help protect the City during difficult economic times.

**Please join me in voting for Proposition B.**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.**

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

---

**PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE**

Proposition B makes good sense from a City management, City employee, and an economic point of view.

That is why we urge you to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.**

**PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY MANAGEMENT**

Proposition B makes good sense for City management because it will require evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and its ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers. That is just good business sense.

**PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY EMPLOYEES**

Proposition B makes good sense for City employees because it gives them the same rights to negotiate for wages and benefits which employees throughout the State already have. And, it gives them the ability to choose better health coverage for their families instead of pay increases. At a time when so many families need better health coverage, this is a sensible option.

**PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD ECONOMIC SENSE**

Proposition B makes good economic sense because it will change the rigid salary formulas which currently lock the City in each year regardless of the budget realities, pitting them against the many vital services the City needs to have money to pay for.

Proposition B is a well thought out compromise plan which will meet the needs of the City and provide fairness to City employees.

**PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE.**

Please join us in voting yes on Proposition B.

Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Senator Milton Marks
Assemblymember John Burton
City Attorney Louise Renne
Civil Service Commissioner A. Lee Munson
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Naomi Gray
Nancy C. Levin, Former Public Utilities Commissioner
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B WILL HELP FAMILIES RECEIVE AFFORDABLE HEALTH BENEFITS

Today, over SIX MILLION Californians have no health insurance at all, and millions more have inadequate health coverage for themselves and their families.

It seems fair that City employees would have the option of choosing to negotiate for affordable health benefits for their families rather than salary increases. Until now, that has not been possible.

Proposition B will provide City employees with the ability to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

That is why we urge you to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Proposition B is meaningful reform. In the current economic climate, Proposition B is timely. Virtually all other counties throughout the Bay Area already allow their employees these rights and benefits. Proposition B will move the City forward in a positive direction.

This year, the City was able to save $62 million in the budget through employees foregoing salary increases. Providing a more equitable salary and health benefit plan for City employees in the future will go a long way towards providing fiscal flexibility for the City and fairness to its employees.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Joseph P. Lacey, Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
Lulu Carter, 1st Vice Chair, Democratic Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Pres., Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and
Gay Democratic Club
Sharon Eberhardt, President, Greater Mission Democratic Club

PROPOSITION B IS FAIR AND SENSIBLE REFORM

San Francisco has a proud history for fairness and for sensible reform.

Proposition B is sensible reform timely and in the best interests of San Francisco taxpayers, and to the City employees we depend on to provide critical services we have come to expect.

That is why we urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

This year the City saved $62 million because of City employees foregoing salary increases. But without meaningful changes, this will only be a one-year fix for a more fundamental issue.

Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State. It is an equitable plan which has taken into consideration what is best for the City and contains a number of safeguards to make sure that the City’s economic position is protected in all negotiations.

And, at a time when affordable health insurance is such a basic necessity for all families, Proposition B will allow City employees the ability to negotiate for health benefits as opposed to salary increases. This is only fair.

I had the responsibility for protecting the City’s economic well-being and worked under a different salary setting standard.

Proposition B is the sensible and fair, fiscally responsible reform needed at this time in the City’s history.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Former San Francisco Mayor Joseph L. Alioto
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote No — "B" is an outrageous proposal concocted by the mayor and municipal workers' unions to raid our treasury on behalf of 46,000 active and retired Municipal workers.

Vote No — it takes from the voters and gives the mayor and workers' unions power to invalidate all voter laws regulating duties, hours, conditions and benefits of workers.

Vote No — it forces workers to join a union. It sets up a 3 tiered system of setting all compensations and conditions, giving workers the choice of the system in the workers' best interest, not the taxpayers'.

Vote No — Supervisors will never select impartial arbitrators. During the past two strikes Supervisors picked arbitrators selected by the unions. I know. I was there.

Vote No — Current laws regulating compensations are fair to workers and taxpayers. Not once since these laws were adopted by the voters in 1976 have they been adhered to. What we really need is someone to sue the mayor and Board to forcing them to follow the law.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor

Proposition B is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It has been broadly propagated to San Francisco taxpayers as a cost saver. It is nothing of the sort; it eliminates almost all the limitations upon the power of the incumbent Mayor and Board of Supervisors to grant approximately 29,000 public employees unprecedented salaries, benefits and other favors. The Charter limitation of like pay for like work is eliminated and replaced with glittering generalities. The Charter requirement of voter approval of a dental plan is circumvented by a legal artifice which, according to the Controller, will cost $13,000,000 per year. An expensive additional bureaucracy is established for purposes of binding arbitration if an impasse occurs between employee organizations and the City. None of the arbitrators need be a public official accountable to the taxpayers of San Francisco; none need even live in San Francisco! Proposition B also creates another City employee relations board although we already have such a board in the Civil Service Commission. That's why the Controller states that Proposition B will increase costs in "a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount." Finally, it allows certain public employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992 at a cost of approximately $1,000,000 per year and effectively eliminates the requirement of voter approval to increase benefits or change working conditions.

Proposition B is unjustified and I urge a "NO" vote.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

I strongly support collective bargaining, but Proposition B is a bad deal for the City. Proposition B means collective bargaining only for some employees. Proposition B retains our old salary setting method that has caused inflated wages for our employees.

Wage reform must be universal and fair to employees and the City. Proposition B is not a reform. The City will incur enormous costs from using two salary methods. Massive tax increases will be needed to pay for this election year giveaway by Art Agnos to his favorite union buddies.

Do not be misled. Vote NO on Proposition B!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The City Charter currently provides that the salaries of approximately 29,000 City, School District and Community College employees are based on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Like pay for like work is the principle. Salaries and fringe benefits currently amount to just less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Now, as part of a “budget agreement” for fiscal year 1991-92, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors would have us approve a more expensive arrangement. In addition to permitting public employee unions unlimitedly to negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, Proposition B expressly allows binding salary setting, benefit and working condition decisions by non-public officials, non-residents (who are accountable to no one!), two additional City employee paid holidays for three years, at a cost of $1,000,000 per year and a dental plan which alone will cost the City an extra $13,000,000 per year, according to the City Controller. Reposing salary and compensatory benefit discretion in the present Board of Supervisors and Mayor is just asking for financial trouble, especially with almost final decision-making power in non-elected “arbitrators” who account to no one and needn’t even live in our City!

A memorandum of understanding with the City allows the unions, even those that opt for collective bargaining, to use the old formulas next year to catch up from the 1991-92 wage freeze. According to budget analyst Harvey Rose, “Employees will receive salary standardization . . . and, in addition, may receive further adjustments from the outcome of the collective bargaining for 1992-93.”

If you believe that our current system treats City workers fairly, you’ll vote against this costly measure.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5 and 8.409-6 relating to rights and obligations of employees and employer concerning bargaining and impartial arbitration of employment disputes for miscellaneous employees.

The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5, and 8.409-6 to read as follows:

NOTE: These Sections are entirely new.
Part 1A: Rights and Obligations of Employees and Employer Concerning Collective Bargaining and Impartial Arbitration of Employment Disputes.
8.409 Declaration of Policy
It is hereby declared to be the policy of the city and county of San Francisco that strikes by city employees are not in the public interest and that, in accordance with Government Code Section 3507(c), a method should be adopted for peacefully and equitably resolving disputes. It is the further purpose and policy of the city and county of San Francisco that in the event the procedures herein adopted are invoked by the city and county of San Francisco or by a recognized employee organization representing employees covered by

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

City. The City shall also have the right to determine the mission of its constituent departments, officers, boards and commissions; set standards of services to be offered to the public; and exercise control and discretion over the city's organization and operations. The City may also relieve city employees from duty due to lack of work or funds, and may determine the methods, means and personnel by which the city's operations are to be conducted.

However, the exercise of such rights does not preclude employees or their representatives from utilizing the grievance procedure to process grievances regarding the practical consequences of any such actions on wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment whenever memoranda of understanding providing a grievance procedure are in full force and effect.

It is the declared intent of the voters that the state statutes referenced in this part be those in effect on the effective date of this part. 8.409-1 Employees Covered

These Sections 8.409 through 8.409-6, inclusive, shall apply to miscellaneous employees as described in Section 8.401 of this charter and including employees of San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Any recognized employee organization, on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect not later than January 3, 1992 to have wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment set pursuant to this part. Thereafter, any recognized employee organization which has remained within the coverage of Sections 8.401 and 8.407 on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect to be covered by this part; provided however, such election shall be effective nine months from the date of that election. Any election to be covered by this part shall thereafter be irrevocable, and affected classifications will not thereafter be subject to the provisions of sections 8.401 and 8.407 of this charter. Employee classifications represented by a recognized employee organization which does not opt to be covered by this part shall continue to be covered by the provisions of sections 8.401 and 8.407 of this charter and such classifications shall not be covered by any of the provisions of this part.

Nothing herein shall preclude a recognized employee organization from electing to include employees in classifications covered by section 8.403 of this Charter within the coverage of this part as a separate bargaining unit, provided however, that the election shall be irrevocable and such employees shall not thereafter be subject to the provisions of section 8.403.

Employees in classifications not represented by a recognized employee organization as of January 3, 1992 shall be entitled to represent themselves with the city and county over wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment to the extent required by state law and shall not be subject to the provisions of Sections 8.401 and 8.407, or the arbitration provisions of Section 8.409-4 of this charter. The Mayor annually shallpropose all forms of compensation for unrepresented employees including salaries, hours, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment subject to approval or disapproval of the board of supervisors. Consistent with other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission may adopt rules and procedures relating to said unrepresented employees.

In addition, subject to the approval or disapproval of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor may create, for employees designated as management, a management compensation package that recognizes and provides incentives for outstanding managerial performance contributing to increased productivity and efficiency in the work force. In formulating such a package, the Mayor shall take into account data developed in conjunction with the civil service commission regarding the terms of executive compensation in other public and private jurisdictions. 8.409-2 Interim Freezing

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.407 of this charter, from January 3, 1992 through March 31, 1992, in return for acceptance of a wage freeze for fiscal year 1991-92, all recognized employee organizations representing classifications electing to remain within the coverage of charter sections 8.401 and 8.407 may, on a one time only basis, elect to bargain for no more than two additional paid training or furlough days per year to be effective only in fiscal years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95, and a dental plan, in recognition of the wage freeze for 1991-92. Such bargaining shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided herein or any other provision of the charter, ordinance, or state law. 8.409-3 Obligation to Bargain in Good Faith

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, or of the ordinances, rules or regulations of the city and county of San Francisco and its departments, boards and commissions, the city and county of San Francisco, through its duly authorized representatives and recognized employee organizations representing classifications of employees covered by this part shall have the mutual obligation to bargain in good faith on all matters within the scope of representation as defined by Government Code section 3504, relating to the wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of city and county employment, including the establishment of procedures for the resolution of grievances concerning the interpretation or application of any agreement, and including agreements to provide binding arbitration of discipline and discharge; provided, however that, except as far as they affect compensation, those matters within the jurisdiction of the civil service commission which establish, implement and regulate the civil service merit system shall not be subject to bargaining under this part: the authority, purpose, definitions, administration and organization of the merit system and the civil service commission; policies, procedures and funding of the operations of the civil service commission and its staff; the establishment and maintenance of a classification plan including the classification and reclassification of positions and the allocation and reallocation of positions to the various classification; status rights; the establishment of standards, procedures and qualifications for employment, recruitment, application, examination, selection, certification and appointment; the establishment, administration and duration of eligible lists; probationary status and the administration of probationary periods, except duration; pre-employment and fitness for duty medical examinations except for the conditions under which referrals for fitness for duty examinations will be made, and the imposition of new requirements; the designation of positions as exempt, temporary, limited tenure, part-time, seasonal or permanent; resignation with satisfactory service and reappointment; exempt entry level appointment of the handicapped; approval of payrolls; and conflict of interest. Nothing in this paragraph shall limit the obligation of the civil service commission to meet and confer as appropriate under state law.

Unless and until agreement is reached through bargaining between authorized representatives of the city and county of San Francisco and authorized representatives of recognized employee organizations for the employee classifications covered by this part, or a determination is made through the procedure set forth in section 8.409-4 hereinafter provided, no existing wages, written terms or conditions of employment, fringe benefits, or long-standing past practices for said employees shall be altered, eliminated or changed except in cases of emergency. This paragraph shall be effective only until the approval of the first memorandum of understanding with a covered employee organization or six months from the effective date of this part whichever occurs sooner.

During the term of an MOU, disputes regarding changes in wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided in this part, but may be subject to grievance arbitration.

No bargaining unit may be included in more than one memorandum of understanding with the city and county of San Francisco. Departmental or bargaining unit memoranda of understanding with the city and county of San Francisco shall be considered by the city and county of San Francisco and its departments, boards and commissions, the city and county of San Francisco, through its duly authorized representatives and recognized employee organizations representing classifications of employees covered by this part as a separate bargaining unit under the provisions of section 8.409-4 of this charter. The Mayor annually shall
wages, hours, or other terms and conditions of employment.

8.409-4 Impasse Resolution Procedures

(a) Subject to Section 8.409-4(g), disputes pertaining to wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment which remain unresolved after good faith bargaining between the city and county of San Francisco, on behalf of its departments, boards and commissions, and a recognized employee organization representing classifications of employees covered under this part shall be submitted to a three-member mediation/arbitration board ("the board") upon the declaration of an impasse either by the authorized representative of the city and county of San Francisco or by the authorized representative of the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute.

(b) Not later than January 20 of any year in which bargaining on an MOU takes place, representatives designated by the city and county of San Francisco and representatives of the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining pursuant to this part shall each select and appoint one person to the board. The third member of the board shall be selected by agreement between the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization, and shall serve as the neutral chairperson of the board.

In the event that the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining cannot agree upon the selection of the chairperson within ten (10) days after the selection of the city and county and employee organization members of the board, either party may then request the American Arbitration Association or California State Media

(c) Any proceeding convened pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with, subject to, and governed by Title 9 of Part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The board may hold public hearings, receive evidence from the parties and, at the request of either party, cause a transcript of the proceedings to be prepared. The board, in the exercise of its discretion, may meet privately with the parties to mediate or mediate/arbitrate the dispute. The board may also adopt other procedures designed to encourage an agreement between the parties, expedite the arbitration hearing process, or reduce the cost of the arbitration process.

(d) In the event no agreement is reached prior to the conclusion of the arbitration hearings, the board shall direct each of the parties to submit, within such time limit as the board may establish, a package last offer of settlement on the remaining issues in dispute. The board shall by majority vote decide which package most nearly conforms to those factors traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of public and private employment, including, but not limited to: changes in the average consumer price index for goods and services; the wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment of employees performing similar services; the wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment of other employees in the city and county of San Francisco; health and safety of employees; the financial resources of the city and county of San Francisco; other demands on the city and county's resources; revenue projections; the power to levy taxes and raise revenue by enhancements or other means; budgetary reserves; and limitations on the amount and use of revenues and expenditures.

The board, by majority vote, shall enter a written decision selecting the package of one or the other party in its entirety.

(e) To be effective the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year, an agreement shall be reached or the board shall reach a final decision no later than sixty days before the date the Mayor is required to submit a budget to the board of supervisors, except by mutual agreement of the parties. After reaching a decision, the board shall serve by certified mail or by hand delivery a true copy of its decision to the parties. Except as otherwise provided by this part, the arbitration decision shall supersede any and all other relevant formulae, procedures and provisions of this chapter relating to wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment, and it shall be final and binding on the parties to the dispute.

However, the decision of the board may be challenged by either party pursuant to Title 9 of part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Within 8 working days of the board's issuance of its written decision, the authorized representative of either party may appeal from the decision of the board to the board of supervisors. The appeal shall be filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors and served on the other party by the clerk. The board of supervisors may reject the decision of the board within 21 days of the filing of any appeal. Subject to the provisions of this section, if the board's decision is not overruled by a motion of the board of supervisors on a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3), the decision shall become final and binding. Should the board of supervisors overrule the decision of the arbitration board, the last best offer package of the other party shall become effective. Thereafter, the city and county of San Francisco, its designated officers, employees and representatives and the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute shall take whatever action necessary to carry out and effectuate the final decision.

(f) The expenses of the proceedings commenced pursuant to this part, including the fee for the services of the chairperson of the board, the cost of preparation of the transcript of the proceedings and other costs related to the conduct of the proceedings, as determined by the board, shall be borne equally by the parties. All other expenses which the parties may incur are to be borne by the party incurring such expenses.

(g) The impasse resolution procedures set forth in Section 8.409-4, or in any other provision of the charter, ordinance or state law shall not apply to any rule, policy, procedure, order or practice which relates or pertains to the purpose, goals or requirements of a consent decree, or which is necessary to ensure compliance with federal, state or local laws, ordinances or regulations. In the event the city acts on a matter it has determined relates to or pertains to a consent decree, or in the event the city acts to ensure compliance with federal, state, or local laws, ordinances or regulations, and the affected employee organization disputes said determination, that determination or action shall not be subject to arbitration, but may be challenged in a court of competent jurisdiction.

8.409-5 Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, retirement and death allowances shall continue to be set and adjusted pursuant to Chapter Five of this Article.

However, death benefits and survivor allowances, retirement allowances, adjustments to retirement allowances and adjustments to continuant allowances payable by the retirement system and based on fiscal year 1991-1992 wages and salaries covered by charter section 8.407, shall be calculated for all employees covered by charter sections 8.401 and 8.407 based on the rates certified by the civil service commission to the board of supervisors as though the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance vetoed by the mayor had become law. No such payment shall exceed the maximum amount permitted by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, or the maximum amount which would still permit the retirement system to preserve its tax-qualified status under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

After June 30, 1992, adjustments to retirement allowances and any continuant allowances shall not be greater than they would have been had the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance vetoed by the Mayor become law.

8.409-6 Employee Relations Rules

Within sixty (60) days of adoption of this amendment, the Mayor shall appoint a panel which after consultation with all parties of interest, shall review the current employee relations ordinance and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for such changes as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this part.

Such changes shall include the creation of an employee relations board. The duties of the employee relations board shall include hearing and making determinations concerning unfair labor practice charges, disputes regarding representation matters, and unit determinations.
PROPOSITION C

Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period are part of the Charter. The Charter can be changed only by the voters. Other employment rules are in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission can change these Rules after public hearings. Generally, the City must also meet and confer with employee organizations representing employees affected by the rule changes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would remove from the Charter the rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period and place them in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. This measure would allow these rules to be changed by the Civil Service Commission after public hearings and, where required, meeting and conferring with employee organizations.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove these rules from the Charter and place them in the Civil Service Commission Rules.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep these rules in the Charter.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Since this measure takes charter provisions which at present can only be changed by a vote of the electorate and incorporates them as Civil Service Rules which may be administratively revised, in my opinion, there is no direct cost effect. However, future rule changes could increase or decrease costs in presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Civil Service Rules

PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

As part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, we need Proposition C to begin the long-overdue modernization of our Civil Service operations.

During the past year, the Civil Service Commission conducted an in-depth study of ways to improve operations and reduce costs. The Commission conducted four months of public hearings, listening to hundreds of individual’s testimony.

The Commission concluded, “The present Civil Service Charter provisions lead to excessive delays, red tape, and millions of dollars of unproductive operating expenses for City Departments.” With the passage of Propositions C, D and E, the Commission estimates the City workforce could be reduced by 2%, for an annual savings of $20 to $30 million.

Proposition C modernizes some of the archaic personnel procedures now in the Charter. Ten Charter sections consisting of detailed personnel rules would become Civil Service Commission Rules. These Rules would be updated by the Commission.

The Commission would continue as appropriate to hold public hearings and meet and confer sessions with employee organizations before making any changes in these Rules.

The ten Charter sections that would become Commission Rules deal with qualification of applicants, examinations, protests of exams and eligible lists, examination procedures for veterans and employees on military leave, duration of eligible lists, limited tenure appointments, temporary and emergency appointments and dismissals during the probation period.

Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to insure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition C will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.

Absen: Supervisor Migden.

REBUETAL TO PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Don’t be tricked. In recent years the Civil Service Commission has abandoned its role as an independent enforcement agency. It is now a rubber-stamp commission that allows political appointees to do whatever they want — at great cost.

Gone is fairness in the top levels of City employment. Back is favoritism. People with the right friends have the most access to high-paying City jobs; and Civil Service does nothing to prevent this.

The departments are the ones claiming “cost savings” because they want a free hand to pick whomever they want for City jobs. The Chamber of Commerce wants you to vote for this so they can get their friends City jobs.

Civil Service is supposed to make sure that jobs are filled from lists of qualified candidates. Civil Service is responsible for exams, so if any candidate who makes the list is not qualified, it’s the Commission’s own fault.

Civil Service has also neglected to develop certain lists altogether, particularly for top positions. That way, the departments can choose whomever they like for lucrative jobs.

If the Commission were doing what the Charter mandates, we wouldn’t have so many high-paid, overlapping bureaucracies.

We are not afraid of change; we are afraid of what will happen if you give the Commission, and by extension the Mayor and his department heads, a free hand in hiring.

We need our resources to go toward services, not patronage.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C.

Citizens Against Political Patronage
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t be mislead by fancy words and false promises. Under the guise of “modernizing civil service,” this proposition opens the door to political patronage in City employment.

Voters have spoken on this issue many times — as recently as last November, when “exemptions” for top deputies in the Public Utilities Commission were handily defeated. The last time the City tried to sneak these same “modernizations” past the electorate, you voted it down overwhelmingly.

This proposal will not correct problems in Charter rules; The real problem is the City’s failure to live within the rules.

This measure will not save money — it will cost money. Lots of it. The payroll will become further bloated with high-paid political appointments, exempt and “temporary” positions — all of which cost real money. This diverts funds from necessary services to reward friends of department heads and politicians.

The real reform that is needed is for the City to live within the merit system by providing regular, non-biased civil service exams, not by giving the people in power the right to change the rules to meet their whims.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C — stop political patronage.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Propositions C, D and E will begin the process of modernizing the Civil Service System — a job that is long overdue.

Under current rules, an individual who scored 70% on a test must be hired, even though there are candidates for this job who scored 95% the next time a test was given.

The opponents of Proposition C agree the system isn’t working. Yet they urge you to maintain the status quo. That doesn’t make good business sense.

Proposition C, D and E, the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, could save the City an estimated $20 million to $30 million a year in unnecessary spending, while broadening job opportunities.

Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to ensure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system. It will in no way encourage or increase patronage. Proposition C has nothing to do with the number of exempt appointments or high-paying jobs in City Government.

Proposition C will begin the process of modernizing the inefficient, slow and costly personnel procedures currently being used. The public hearing process, before the independent Civil Service Commission, will be maintained to ensure the fairness of the process. Allowing personnel procedures to be updated through public hearings and meetings DOES NOT increase patronage.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

For good government and a modern personnel system, support the transfer of Civil Service procedures from the Charter to Commission rules.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition C, will reform the city’s outdated civil service system, without harming merit hiring protections.

The Charter currently restricts the Civil Service Commission’s ability to produce examinations and lists of job applicants in a timely way.

Proposition C will give greater flexibility to the Commission, reducing the costs of operating the examination process while producing better hiring lists.

Join business, labor and our elected officials in voting Yes on Proposition C.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

City workers ought to be able to bargain over workplace rules. Currently our system is so rigid that it takes years to offer exams for positions. Vote “yes” to modernize our out-of-date system.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- WIDER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS
WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Eni R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is not reform — it’s a power grab!

San Francisco government hardly needs more politics in its hiring practices.

The mayor repeatedly abuses his hiring authority. He circumvents merit selection, favors outsiders, and creates fat-salaried posts for political patronage.

Proposition C is the latest power grab!

San Francisco was spilling with red budget ink this year. City workers went without raises, and deep cuts were made in health programs. Despite these sacrifices, the mayor created a new — $120,000.00 — position in Civil Service.

Why? So Mayor Agnos could replace the general manager with his own political appointee — while keeping the old general manager on payroll. We’re now paying two people the salary of general manager!

More padding is going on at Social Services and Health Departments.

Imagine the outcome if the merit selection laws are stripped away.

Proposition C is a power grab!

Richard D. Hongisto, Assessor

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, relating to qualifications, examinations, eligible lists, provisional appointments and dismissal during probation, and adding new section 8.320-1 incorporating the provisions of the above sections into Civil Service Commission rules.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, and adding new section 8.320-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.320-1 Incorporating Former Charter Provisions

The provisions of the following sections of the Charter, in the form existing prior to November 1, 1971, shall be incorporated in the rules of the Civil Service Commission, and shall remain in effect until or unless amended by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to its charter authority and subject to any applicable meet and confer or bargaining requirements under state law.

8.320 Qualification of Applicants
8.321 Examination of Applicants
8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers
8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles
8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations
8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave
8.330 Duration of List of Eligibles
8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments
8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments
8.340 Dismissal during Probationary Period
8.326 Qualifications of Applicants
(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by Section 8.340 of this Charter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the Civil Service Commission.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 18 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age at the time of appointment.

(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 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 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 10 days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned. (Amended November, 1986)

8.321 Examination of Applicants

All applicants for places in the classified service shall submit to examinations which shall be competitive provided, however, that no examination shall be deemed to be competitive unless two or more persons shall participate, except that any such examination may be held for one qualified applicant on recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors, after a finding by the board that reasonable publicity of the proposed examination has been given. Such examinations shall be without charge to the applicants. The commission shall control all examinations and may employ substitute persons in or out of the public service to act as examiner. The examinations used shall measure the relative capacities of the persons examined to perform the functions, duties and responsibilities of the classification to which they seek appointment. Examinations shall consist of selection techniques which will test fairly the relative qualifications, merit and fitness of the applicants for the position to be filled.

Examinations may include written tests to determine job-related aptitude, knowledge, or achievements and oral tests by qualifications-appraisal boards. The Civil Service Commission shall establish rules governing the size and composition of qualification-appraisal boards. Qualification-appraisal boards may consider, in the case of employees of the City and County of San Francisco, all prior-performance evaluations completed on civil service forms and in the case of all applicants may be part of their evaluation of candidates for employment to any position. Appropriate rosters of eligibles established by a trade, craft or occupation joint-apprenticeship committee recognized by the State of California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards, may be utilized to fill apprenticeship positions or as the basis for establishing apprenticeship eligibility list. The commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of the tests to rate the capacity of the applicants to perform service for the city and county. The commission may, for each examination, establish a passing mark or may determine the total number of persons who shall constitute the list of eligibles. The commission shall prepare from the returns of the examiners the list of eligibles, arranged in order of relative performance. No question submitted to applicants shall refer to political or religious opinions or fraternally affiliations. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotive written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three working days for entrance examinations or five working days for promotional or combined entrance-promotive examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the Civil Service Commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligible's rank and score, except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance-promotive written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period, the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period, the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond 60 days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protests(s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to be adopted eligible list. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations

Veterans with 30 days or more active service, and widows or widowers of such veterans, who become eligible for appointment by attaining the passing mark in any entrance examination, shall be allowed an additional credit of five percent in making up the list of eligibles established by such examination. The term "veteran" as used in this section shall be taken to mean any person who has been mustered into, or served in, or enlisted in the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard and served on active duty in said branch of the armed forces of the United States, not including reserve service, at any time for a period of 30 days or more in time of war and been separated from active duty and under conditions other than dishonorable. (Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C (Continued)

honorable and not resulting from court martial, except to individual entering the armed forces or, after January 27, 1973, the date of the creation of the volunteer army, shall receive veterans preference in civil service entrance examination for service of any type in the armed forces of the United States. In addition, an individual qualifying for veterans preference as herein defined shall be deemed entitled thereto on his or her date of separation from active duty in the armed forces.

No person so qualified shall be granted veterans preference unless he or she indicates qualification therefor on an examination application received by the Civil Service Commission not later than 10 years from the date of his or her first enrollment thereto. When an eligible has secured a permanent appointment from a list of eligibles derived from an entrance examination, in which he or she has been allowed additional credits of five percent as herein provided, and has served the full probationary period therein as provided in this Charter, such other additional credits of five percent that have been allowed him or her on the list of eligibles, derived from other entrance examinations, shall be automatically cancelled; and his or her date of entrance on such other list as revised to accord with his or her relative standing before such additional credits were added and he or she shall not be allowed such additional credits in any other examinations. The Civil Service Commission may, for services or employment specified by the commission, allow general or individual preference, but not more than 10 percent, for entrance appointment of veterans who have suffered permanent disability in the line of duty, provided that such disability would not prevent the proper performance of the duties required under such service, or employment, and provided that such disability is of record in the United States Veterans' Administration.

Definition of Time of War

In the administration hereafter of the provisions of this section of this Charter, the expression "time of war" shall include the following periods of time:

(a) the period of time from the commencement of a war as shown by any declaration of war, of the Congress of the United States, or by any statute or resolution of the Congress, a purpose of which is to declare in any manner the existence of a state of war, until the time of termination thereof by any true, treaty of peace, act of hostility, or otherwise;

(b) the period of time during which the United States is or has been engaged in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared;

(c) the period of time during which the United States is or has been assisting the United Nations or any nation or nations in accordance with existing treaty obligations, in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared; and

(d) the period of time during which the United States is engaged in a campaign or an expedition in which a medal has been authorized by the government of the United States, provided, however, that no person shall be eligible for the benefits provided for veterans in this section unless he shall have been eligible to receive such a medal: 8:329 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in Section 8:324 of this Charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists shall, for the purpose of this amendment be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, the employee desires to participate therein must apply in writing to the Civil Service Commission within 30 days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within 30 days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The Civil Service Commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The Civil Service Commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or more than the minimum passing mark established by the Civil Service Commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative standings obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employee shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules and procedures: 8:329 Limited Tenure Examinations

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8:320, 8:321, 8:324 and 8:330 hereof, the Civil Service Commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the Civil Service Commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8:320, 8:321, 8:324 and 8:330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only

(Continued on next page)
until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the Civil Service Commission without reference to the procedure governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall be subject to the determination of the Civil Service Commission as defined elsewhere in this Charter or by rule of the Civil Service Commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of the Charter. Service after January 1, 1951, under limited tenure appointment, by persons employed by the municipal railway shall not be included in the calculation of service for purposes of determining appointments or of service upon whose tenure appointments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this Charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The Civil Service Commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approval of the Board of Supervisors by ordinance not less than two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the Board of Supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer, another list exists which is deemed by the Civil Service Commission to be suitable to provide temporary service, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding 130 working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond 90 days must be approved by the Civil Service Commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 130 working days at the time civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the Charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position in question, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the Charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding 30 working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 30 working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the Charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointments as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding 120 working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefore shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such 120 working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the Mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the Mayor shall request the superintendents to make supplemental appropriations therefore in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations. 8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The Civil Service Commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of 12 months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for 12 months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after 12 months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program; but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment. Provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in Section 8.342 for such charges. With respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the sheriff's department the probationary period shall be completed 18 months after the date of hire. Probationary periods of 12 months and up to a maximum of 24 months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the Civil Service Commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the Civil Service Commission shall review the termination. The Civil Service Commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination, the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination, the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the Civil Service Commission. The commission shall render a decision within 30 days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; or (c) withhold such person from the classification which that person was promoted and may reclassify the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotion classification under such conditions as the commission shall determine. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the Civil Service Commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if incompetent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Civil Service Commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.
MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote.
Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.

Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?
Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting
October 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
Civil Service Eligibles  

PROPOSITION D

Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Persons who apply for City jobs must take a test to measure their qualifications. Applicants who pass the test are placed on a list ranked from the highest score to the lowest. Ties are broken by lottery. City departments may hire any of the top three persons on the list. This is known as the rule of three. This rule is in the Charter, and the Charter can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would allow any one of the persons with the top three scores on a list to be hired. Under Proposition D ties in test scores would not be broken. This means there could be more than three persons with the top three scores.

This is known as the rule of three scores. Proposition D would give the Civil Service Commission the authority to adopt rules allowing additional qualified applicants on a list to be considered. The Civil Service Commission could adopt such rules only after a process that includes public hearings and meeting and conferring with employee organizations when required. These rule changes would no longer require a change in the Charter.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the City's hiring process.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
Civil Service Eligibles

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

A major part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, Proposition D revises the “Rule of Three” and in the process will save the City millions of dollars annually by eliminating unnecessary temporary positions.

The “Rule of Three” requires departments to hire from only three names in filling a position. When candidates have identical exam scores, one candidate is arbitrarily ranked above another, using a lottery based on social security numbers.

Because most managers find this too restrictive and too difficult to hire the best qualified person for a job, they often add positions and hire temporary employees who they believe can get the job done. This adds millions of dollars annually to the City’s costs.

*Proposition D will end this spending, and in the process, make City government operate more efficiently.*

Under Proposition D departments will be able to choose from all candidates with the highest three scores. With tie scores occurring on 25% of exams, departments will have more candidates to choose from.

Other Bay Area cities already allow more candidates to be considered for a job. San Jose uses the number of vacancies plus ten additional names, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties use the seven highest scores.

San Francisco has 1,700 job classifications, more than the Federal government. With these new standards, the Civil Service Commission will create fewer, broader classifications. Proposition D will allow departments to choose from more candidates to find the best person for the job.

Allowing more candidates for a job will expand opportunities for City employees, help departments meet equal opportunity employment goals and reduce the cost of City government.

*Vote YES on Proposition D.*

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

It’s true — the Civil Service Commission’s most important job is preventing patronage — too bad they haven’t done so.

The City payroll is more loaded down with political appointees than ever before, even though the Civil Service Commission is supposed to protect the citizenry from employment abuses.

What the politicians and their appointees think of as “red tape” are the very same voter-approved Charter provisions that keep political patronage in check.

Send a message to the City that you would rather have them live within the reasonable Charter rules for hiring than spend time devising end runs around the rules.

Protect merit hiring — tell the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, their commissioners and department heads that you don’t like City employment treated as a private club.

*VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D.*

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

This proposition opens the door to political patronage.
If you want to give politicians and their appointees power to hand out jobs, vote for this proposition.
If you want to ensure fair, non-political civil service employment, VOTE NO ON D.
Buried in verbiage about breaking tie scores is a long-standing attempt to eliminate Charter-mandated rules that protect fair employment in City government.
Maybe the City thought voters wouldn’t notice that this proposition is the same as Prop C. Either measure will take rules regulating civil service employment out of the Charter and place them in the hands of politicians and their appointees.
One California city has a “rule of three scores” but department heads must provide written justification for choosing anyone other than the top candidate for the job. The result is that 90 percent of all promotions go to the top candidates — because the reasons for appointing someone else are almost always political.
Don’t be misled. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Protect civil service employment from political influence.
Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains safeguards to ensure fair, non-political civil service employment. It will help to eliminate the current practice of adding extra jobs or hiring temporary employees, which adds millions of dollars to City expenses annually and makes government work less efficiently.
Prop. D has nothing to do with political appointments or patronage. Prop. D will provide a better system to select the best qualified person for an open position, following Civil Service Rules. Other Bay Area cities don’t have patronage problems when they choose from more than three qualified candidates. Why should San Francisco?
Under Proposition D, Civil Service will continue to test applicants and prepare eligible lists. Departments will hire qualified applicants from these lists, following Civil Service Rules.
The only change made here is that we will eliminate wasteful spending and broaden opportunities to hire the best individuals to fill vital City jobs. Given that fact, why would anyone urge you to maintain the status quo?
Why should San Francisco waste millions of dollars a year to continue outmoded personnel practices?
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

For good government and a fair and efficient personnel system support Proposition D.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition D is part of a civil service reform package of Charter amendments that deserve your Yes vote.

The Charter currently restricts the ability of department heads to fill a job vacancy with the best qualified applicant. Proposition D will allow the Civil Service Commission to give department heads greater discretion when choosing among job applicants. This will assure that our tax dollars are being spent on a qualified workforce that mirrors the diversity of San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

People who get the same scores on civil service tests ought to be treated the same way. Proposition D establishes that basic rule of fair play. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- WIDER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D and E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco
Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition D

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, relating to the certification of eligibles.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this Charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the Civil Service Commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of all those persons meeting the certification rule established for that classification. The Civil Service Commission shall establish certification rules. Certification rules shall not be more restrictive than the certification of all candidates receiving the three highest scores on the list of eligibles for such positions. Of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position, in case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which the certification is to be made there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.329 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex; provided however, the appointing officer shall give due consideration to applicable civil service equal employment opportunity (EEO) goals so as to maximize diversity at all levels of city employment. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall annually review each department's performance in meeting its civil service EEO obligations.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, relating to the removal or discharge of permanent employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.341 Dismissal for Cause Removal or Discharge of Permanent, Non-Probationary Employees

A. Any person employed under the civil service provisions of this charter, exclusive of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments as provided under Section 8.343 hereof, in a position defined by the commission as “permanent” may be removed or discharged by the appointing officer except for just cause, upon being provided with written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and by an opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the appointing officer or his or her designee. Pending investigation of conduct involving such hearing, the appointing officer may suspend the person so accused if the accusation against the accused person involves misappropriation of public funds or property, misuse or destruction of public property, drug addiction or habitual intemperance, mistreatment of persons, immorality, acts which would constitute a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, or acts which present an immediate danger to the public health and safety the appointing officer may place the accused person on unpaid administrative leave but such suspension shall not be valid for no more than 30 days unless hearing upon the charges the investigation shall be delayed beyond such time by the act of the accused person. When charges are made the appointing officer imposes discharge or removal he or she shall, in writing, notify the person accused removed or discharged of the time and place where the charges will be heard, right to appeal the discharge or removal by mailing such statement to his last known address. The employee shall have thirty days from the date of mailing of the notice to file an appeal of the matter in writing with the appointing officer. Upon receipt of a timely appeal, (a) the hearing appeal shall be conducted forthwith by a qualified and unbiased hearing officer who shall be employed under contract by the city and county and selected by procedures set forth in the rules of the civil service commission. The hearing officer shall publicly hear and determine charges the appeal, and may approve the discharge or removal, or exonerate, or suspend or the accused.

If the employee is exonerated the hearing officer may, at his discretion, remit the full period of the suspension or any portion thereof and may order payment of salary to the employee for the prescribed period of time under suspension; the discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave, and the report of such period of suspension discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave shall thereafter be expunged from the record of service of such employee.

The civil service commission shall immediately be notified of the charges when made, of the action of the appointing officer to remove or discharge of, the hearing appeal, and of the finding on that. The finding of the hearing officer shall be final.

The civil service commission may remove or discharge an employee hear and determine for any charge filed by a citizen or by any member of or authorized agent of the commission when the appointing officer neglects or refuses to take such action being such charge against the employee within 30 days of notification to the department head of the occurrence or event given giving rise to the charge. Removal or discharge may be made for any cause upon the responsibility of the employee is provided with written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and after the employee has had the opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the civil service commission or its designee. The decision of the civil service commission shall be final.

Nothing in this section shall limit or restrict rules adopted by the commission governing dismissal of probationary employees, lay-offs or reduction in force or providing for the removal of any appointee who has abandoned his or her position as defined by civil service commission rule.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a recognized employee organization and any affected city department may agree to alternative procedures, including final and binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator jointly selected by the employee organization and the city, to deal with charges brought against individual employees, the resolution of such charges and the appropriate discipline, if any, to be imposed on the employee. Said alternative procedures shall be included in a Memorandum of Understanding between the city and the employee organization which shall be effective when ratified by the board of supervisors.

C. The effectiveness of this charter amendment is contingent upon the voters’ approval at the November 5, 1991 election of an amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter. If the amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter is not adopted at the November 5, 1991 election, then it is the voters’ intent that (1) this amendment shall have no force and effect, (2) this amendment shall not become part of the charter, and (3) Section 8.341 shall continue to read as it did immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.

D. Subject to the contingency set forth in Section C above, this charter amendment shall be effective September 1, 1992. Prior to that date, Section 8.341 of this charter shall continue to read as it had immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

PROPOSITION E

Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City department may fire a permanent employee only after a series of steps. The final step is an appeal to an outside hearing officer. The City may only fire the employee if the hearing officer decides that the department has good reasons for the firing. Generally, the employee remains on the job and the payroll until the hearing officer makes a decision. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee cannot be fired.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment that would allow City departments to fire permanent employees and remove them from the payroll. The employee could then appeal the firing to an outside hearing officer. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee would be returned to work. The hearing officer also could give the employee back pay.

Proposition E also would allow a City department and an employee organization to agree to other procedures for firing employees, including binding arbitration. The Board of Supervisors would have to approve these agreements.

Proposition E would go into effect only if the voters also approve Proposition B, the Collective Bargaining charter amendment.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the way permanent City employees are fired.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to change the way permanent City employees are fired.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application it could accelerate the removal/discharge process for City employees and thereby affect the cost of government in an amount presently indeterminable.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is the last part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package and is estimated to save the taxpayers several millions of dollars a year in unnecessary City costs.

Proposition E will allow the City to remove a fired employee from the payroll after a due process hearing. This is the same procedure used in the private sector and in other public agencies. Currently, an employee fired after a due process hearing remains on the payroll until a second hearing occurs. A hearing officer reviews the firing and then makes a final decision.

LESS THAN 3% OF FIRINGS HAVE BEEN REVERSED ON APPEAL. Yet employees now stay on the payroll, sometimes for months after being fired. Some for over a year. Some then retire with a disability.

Not only is this an unnecessary cost, but the department is delayed in filling these positions so that vital services can be provided to taxpayers.

Under Proposition E, a fired employee still has the right to appeal to a hearing officer. If the hearing officer decides the firing was unjust, the employee will be reinstated with back pay. If the employee is represented by a union, binding arbitration may be substituted for a hearing officer.

Proposition E provides equity as well as needed fiscal reform in these economically troubled times.

In order for Proposition E to take effect, Proposition B, the collective bargaining reform measure appearing on your ballot, must also be approved by the voters.

Your Yes vote on Proposition E will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The current 30-day firing rule is a progressive rule that could well be adopted by industry and other public agencies.

The Charter allows managers to remove incompetent employees from the City payroll for the entire 30 days leading up to the employee actually being fired. If incompetent employees are permitted to stay on the payroll, City management has no one to blame but themselves.

The way the current system works is that the longest an employee can stay on the city payroll after being formally charged is 30 days.

The Charter mandates that charges be brought and the firing settled within that time frame.

Under other grievance systems firings can, and do, take months to go through this process — and after the typical long delays and uncertainties, no one is pleased with the results.

Keep the progressive 30-day rule.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Citizens Against Political Patronage
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The present system for firing City employees was adopted by the electorate to provide fair, swift dismissal hearings. Under this system, employees who are about to be fired are suspended without pay for 30-days pending a hearing. Hearing officers then consider the facts and make a ruling before the 30 days run out.

*Proposition E opens the process to long delays with the net result being uncertainty, lost time, money and inefficiency for both employees and the City. Firing could take up to a year or more, instead of 30 days. Justice delayed is justice denied, for all the parties.*

Vote against long delays. Don’t create more costs for the City. For workplace justice and municipal efficiency, keep the 30-day rule. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.**

Citizens Against Political Patronage

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

*Proposition E, part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, is designed to modernize the current firing procedures used by Civil Service and save taxpayers money in the process.*

The current system allows City employees to remain on the payroll for months — in some cases more than a year after they have been fired. They then remain on the payroll until a second hearing before a hearing officer occurs.

Now, only employees who have committed crimes or are a threat to public safety can be suspended without pay after they are fired. This is less than 10% of the firings.

Since less than 3% of all firings are reversed on appeal, our present system is wasting taxpayers money. Let’s modernize our procedures and save money that could be much better spent.

*Proposition E will not delay the process, it will improve it.*

Since Proposition E will save money, modernize the system, and allow San Francisco to use the standard firing procedures used by the private sector and most other public jurisdictions, why would anyone suggest maintaining the status quo?

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E protects an employee's right to a hearing while giving the department head the ability to place an employee on unpaid leave. Because most dismissals are upheld by hearing officers, Proposition E will both improve productivity and save money. Should a dismissal not be upheld, the employee would receive back-pay.

Proposition E is fair to city managers, employees and taxpayers. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Even as employees are fired for such serious offenses as sex harassment, discrimination, or theft, our out-of-date rules require us to continue to pay their salaries through several appeals—sometimes a year long. We can’t hire good people to replace the bad, and city services suffer. This measure allows us to stop paying them after the first appeal, which is the same as in most workplaces. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:
- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- WIDER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickens, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition E

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 Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City employees are military reservists. State law requires the City to pay such employees their full salary for their first 30 days on active duty — except for drills and training. After those 30 days, the City is not allowed to pay employees on active military duty.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow the Board of Supervisors, if requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary, while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances. Employees would receive this benefit only if they are called to active duty for more than 30 days. These additional payments would be limited to 180 days. Payments required under state law would be subtracted from this benefit. Employees released from active duty must return to work for the City within 60 days; otherwise, the benefit would be considered a loan to the employee.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to provide this benefit. A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to provide this benefit.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. The increase in cost would depend upon the number of employees called to service, the duration of their absence and the differential between their City salary and military pay entitlement.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Last fall 37 employees of the city and county of San Francisco responded to our nation’s call and suddenly found themselves in great danger far from home, family and friends. Many of these men and women were the sole or principal breadwinners in their households. Unfortunately, their bills, debts, rent and mortgages did not cease with their call-up.

In many cases their income dropped by more than 50%!

Many private companies attempted to reduce this hardship by partially or fully compensating their employees for the difference between their military pay and their previous civilian pay for up to six months.

Prop. F does not require the city and county of San Francisco to spend any money! All Prop. F does is to allow the city to consider helping prevent our employees from a devastating financial situation at the very time that they are serving our nation.

One of the most heartening things to come out of Operation Desert Storm was that both those who were for the war, and those who were against it, supported our troops.

While Prop. F sadly is not retroactive and cannot help those Persian Gulf War veterans, it will allow us to assist our men and women in uniform should the need arise again.

Please join us in voting YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Working people do not declare war. Most people sent to war are working people. Their families deserve to be taken care of, not left to face economic hardship. This measure gives city workers protection against paycheck gaps caused by military call-ups. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, relating to providing workers salary continuation benefits.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, to add subdivision (i) at the end to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

Section 8.400

(i) Notwithstanding any other limitation in the Charter to the contrary, and subject to meet and confer obligations of state law, the Mayor may request that the Board of Supervisors enact, and the Board shall then have the power to so enact, an ordinance entitling City officers or employees called to active duty with a United States military reserve organization to receive from the City the following as part of the individual's compensation for a period to be specified in the ordinance which may not exceed 180 days, the difference between the amount of the individual's military pay and the amount the individual would have received as a City officer or employee had the employee worked his or her normal work schedule, including any merit raises which otherwise would have been granted during the time the individual was on active duty. Any such ordinance shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

1. The individual must have been called into active service for a period greater than 30 consecutive days.

2. The purpose for such call to active service shall be extraordinary circumstances and shall not include scheduled training, drills, unit training assemblies, or similar events.

3. The amounts authorized pursuant to such an ordinance shall be offset by amounts required to be paid pursuant to any other law in order that there be no double payments.

4. Any individual receiving compensation pursuant to such an ordinance shall execute an agreement providing that if such individual does not return to City service within 60 days of release from active duty, or if the individual is not fit for employment at that time, within 60 days of return to fitness for employment, then that compensation shall be treated as a loan payable with interest at a rate equal to the greater of (i) the rate received for the concurrent period by the Treasurer's Pooled Cash Account or (ii) the minimum amount necessary to avoid imputed income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and any successor statute. Such loan shall be payable in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed 5 years, commencing 90 days after the individual's release from active service or return to fitness for employment, as the case may be.

5. Such an ordinance shall not apply to any active duty served voluntarily after the time that the individual is called to active service.

6. Such ordinance shall not be retroactive. □

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, relating to the reclassification and status of housing police officers.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.530-3 Transfer of Housing Authority Police to the City and County.

The board of supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall have and is hereby granted power to enter into any agreement with the State of California, or any officer, agency or commission of the State of California, and to pass all necessary legislation and to do or perform any other act or acts deemed necessary to effect the transfer of the employment, jurisdiction and control of the Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority to the city and county. The board of supervisors shall make every reasonable effort to consummate such an agreement no later than July 1, 1984.

Pursuant to said agreement, the city and county shall accept the transfer of all Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority from said Authority. All said Housing Police officers who are transferred to the city and county shall become employees of the City and County of San Francisco under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Police Department.

As of January 1, 1992, Housing Police Officers shall be granted status to the classification of Q2 Police Officers, provided that the individuals comply with each of the state mandated requirements for full peace officer status, and each of the City's requirements for appointment to the Q2 classification.

Employees granted Q2 Police Officer status under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions of employment as police officers of the City and County of San Francisco, except that said employees shall be entitled to remain members of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California subject to the approval of the Public Employees' Retirement System to retain said employees. If the City is unable to obtain the agreement of the Public Employees' Retirement System to retain those employees who were Housing Police Officers on January 1, 1992, then said employees will be individually offered the choice of Q2 status and pension benefits under Charter section 8.586 as of January 1, 1992 or retention of their current status in all respects. □
The Way It Is Now: In 1983, Housing Authority police officers were transferred from the Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. Because they were not classified as San Francisco police officers, they do not have the same collective bargaining rights. They continue to belong to the State Public Employees’ Retirement System instead of the City’s retirement system. There are 14 Housing Authority police officers.

The Proposal: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements. They would work under the same terms and conditions as other San Francisco police officers. They could remain in the state Public Employees’ Retirement System if the state approves. If not, each Housing Authority police officer would choose between becoming a San Francisco police officer and joining the City’s retirement system, or continuing as a Housing Authority police officer and staying in the state Public Employees’ Retirement System.

A “Yes” Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements.

A “No” Vote Means: If you vote no, you do not want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco Police Officers.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted it would allow certain Housing Authority police to gain status as sworn Police Officers. If these officers remain in their existing retirement system, there should be no effect on the cost of government. However, if the officers are enrolled in the regular police retirement plan, there could be an increase in the cost of government, based on current salary and fringe benefit levels, of approximately $20,000 per officer per year.

In my opinion, the maximum annual cost, should all current Housing Authority Officers transition to sworn Police Officers and transfer to the higher retirement cost plan, would be approximately $200,000 per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

Housing Authority Police

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Board of Supervisors unanimously supports Proposition G as an equity measure at no significant long-term cost to reclassify no more than twelve former city employees in the official classification of Housing Police Officers to the classification of Q2 Police Officers. The charter amendment corrects a situation which has existed since 1982, when Housing Police Officers were transferred from the San Francisco Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. It is recognized that the employees remaining in the former classification are performing substantially similar duties to those performed by San Francisco Police Officers, and if otherwise qualified, they will be granted status to the Police Officer classification as of January 1, 1992. This Charter Amendment is supported by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Police Commission and the Civil Service Commission.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

What the argument put forth by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors fails to mention is the cost of Proposition G to the taxpayers of San Francisco. While the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, Harvey Rose, the respected Budget Analyst for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, whose financial audits have saved San Francisco taxpayers countless millions over the years, states that Proposition G could result in yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262.

Is this expense reasonable just to reclassify Housing Authority police officers who may or may not opt to join the plan? Definitely not. Housing Authority police officers are currently in the state Public Employees Retirement System. This is one of the best retirement systems in the country. There is absolutely no need to reclassify Housing Authority police officers. This measure is imprudent and unnecessary. The San Francisco Taxpayers Association urges you to vote "NO" on Proposition G.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We urge a vote against Proposition G, simply because City taxpayers cannot afford it. Although the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, the respected Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, found that it could result in additional yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262 to City taxpayers.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G contains no provisions which impose additional costs to the City. Housing Police Officers are paid at the same rate of pay as Q2 Police Officers. Proposition G would merely change their classification to Q2 Police Officers as an equity measure. Housing Police Officers have always been members of the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and will remain in PERS as long as PERS approves. Should PERS not approve the retention of said employees in PERS, each employee will have two options: retain their Housing Police Officer classification and remain in PERS; or to be reclassified as a Q2 Police Officer and join the San Francisco Retirement System. PERS Board members have stated that they would move to approve maintaining the officers in the PERS system as Q2’s upon passage of the Charter amendment, thus resulting in no cost being imposed on the City.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We, the eleven Housing Police officers affected by Proposition G, tried everything possible to keep the charter amendment a no cost measure.

We informed all City representatives that we intend to remain in the Public Employees’ Retirement System and offered to sign any document that would make that binding.

The original draft of this amendment provided language that kept this a no cost measure; but the city attorney insisted on the permissive language which resulted in the possible costs reported in the controller’s statement.

We hope you understand our dilemma and ask for your support.

Please vote yes on Proposition G.

Thank you.

Marco DesAngles, Mission Station
Mike Phelan, Mission Station
Carroll Henry, Northern Station
Lou Vance, Northern Station
John Bain, Potrero Station
Arthur Hernandez, Potrero Station
Harvey Iosua, Potrero Station
Steve Murphy, Potrero Station
Jamie Ongpin, Potrero Station
Melvin Thornton, Potrero Station
Charles Wilkerson, Potrero Station

These men and women have a tough job and they do it well. They are a big part of our success in restoring the Housing Authority. The risks they take are the same as other police officers, and they ought to be treated equally. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

PROPOSITION H
Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor’s Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor’s compensation?

YES ➞ NO ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Charter makes the Mayor responsible for supervising all departments managed by boards and commissions. The Mayor may hire employees to help carry out this responsibility. Mayors have given their employees various titles, including “Deputy Mayor.” Salaries for City employees, including employees in the Mayor’s Office, are set by surveying salaries paid by public and private employers in the Bay Area for similar work.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would prohibit the Mayor from assigning a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Proposition H also would prohibit the City from employing for the Mayor a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Under Proposition H, no employee of the Mayor’s Office could be paid more than 70% of the Mayor’s salary.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed amendment be approved, in my opinion, based on the 1991-92 budget for the Office of the Mayor, a reduction of approximately $28,000 in salary costs could occur.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition H to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 46,720 of the signatures submitted were valid, 6,005 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Deputy Mayor Ban

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Keep Government Clean Committee recommends a "Yes" vote on Proposition H because bloated city government is one of the major symptoms of our city’s financial woes. Proposition H gives San Franciscans the opportunity to ban the contrived position of Deputy Mayor once and for all.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION H

The Agnos administration established seven Deputy Mayors with salaries as high as $103,000 per year. Proposition H would prohibit the Mayor from assigning an employee, regardless of title, to supervise any city department already under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer, another elected official and/or boards or commissions.

San Francisco doesn’t need highly paid bureaucrats overseeing other bureaucrats whose Charter-given responsibility is to manage city departments. The City Charter clearly states the positions the Mayor can appoint. It says nothing about the appointment of "Deputy Mayors." Yet, the incumbent has simply added bureaucrats and bestowed upon them the sham title of "Deputy Mayor."

According to an April, 1990 analysis by Board of Supervisor Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, the annual cost of the Mayor’s office increased $963,477 because of these added expenditures on salaries, pension benefit contributions, health insurance premiums and the like during just the first year of the Agnos administration; that’s money which could’ve been spent on libraries, medical clinics and police and fire protection.

Let's put an end to this wasteful arrogance once and for all. Vote "YES" on H!

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As the independent City Controller has stated, Proposition H only affects three people. It vindictively cuts their salaries approximately $9,000 each. Who are we talking about?

- The City’s Director of Finance, who voluntarily gave up a ten year appointment and took a $22,000 pay cut to direct the City’s budget team during a difficult year. He was recognized for "Excellence in Fiscal Management" and San Francisco was named among "The Top 15 Cities in America" in Finance World’s 1991 edition.

  Independent Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, in a August 13, 1991 report states: "The City and County of San Francisco, which has the most complex budget of any county surveyed, has the lowest number of centralized budget staff devoted to the analysis and preparation of the budget."

- San Francisco’s first African American Deputy Mayor, a second generation native San Franciscan who was this year voted "Man of the Year" by San Francisco Business and Professional Women, Inc.

  San Francisco’s first Asian American Director of the Office of Business and Economic Development. He left a job as a Strategic Planner for the Bank of America to serve the City. He successfully obtained an Enterprise Zone designation from the State, which helps over one-third of San Francisco’s businesses.

  His leadership in recruiting Pacific Rim business for San Francisco was instrumental in Sister Cities International recognizing San Francisco for “Best Performance of any U.S. City” in 1991.

Proposition H does little to reduce the cost of city government. Please vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition H

This year as part of city budget reductions, I reduced the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three. That saved $268,000. Because of this change, the City Controller's official estimate is that Proposition H will only save $28,000. It does so in a punitive manner by cutting the salaries of the city's first African American deputy mayor, first Asian American to direct our city's business office, and most unfairly, cuts the salary of the Director of Finance who volunteered to move from the Controller's job paying 30% more.

The supporters of Proposition H have spent more than twice as much money to qualify the measure as it will save.

Every modern Mayor in our city has employed the positions of Deputy Mayor. It signifies an important member of the Mayor's staff who represents him or her throughout the city and elsewhere.

My political opponents should direct their attacks at me, and settle them honorably in the campaign for Mayor, not by rewriting the City Charter. Please join San Francisco Tomorrow and the Democratic Central Committee in opposing Proposition H.

Mayor Art Agnos

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition H

The Keep Government Clean Committee thanks countless citizens who devoted time and effort to collecting signatures to ensure Proposition H's success particularly Frank Jordan and his campaign volunteers who spent weekend after weekend securing voters' signatures. Their altruistic dedication reflects an abiding desire to keep City Hall honest.

The Mayor's protestations about reducing the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three don't ring true. Neither does his arithmetic. In the first year alone of his seven Deputy Mayors, the cost to taxpayers was over $900,000. Mayor Agnos claims he saved $268,000 by cutting Deputy Mayors from seven to three, and that the Controller estimates Proposition H saves $28,000. But subtracting $268,000 from over $900,000 results in a $632,000 saving from H! During the past 4 years, Agnos' "Deputy Mayor" system has cost taxpayers over $4,000,000. Appointed by the Mayor but a few months ago, the "controlled" Controller forgets that Deputy Mayor titles have merely been altered; such bureaucrats remain, at virtually the same salaries and benefits. The Mayor's "controlled" Controller ignores elimination of positions involving another layer of bureaucracy over Charter-authorized department heads.

The best modern Mayor in our City, George Christopher, never employed a "Deputy Mayor." He followed the Charter, with an appropriate staff which represented him throughout the City, nobly and effectively. "Deputy Mayors," unlike department heads, have no Charter authority! They're not accountable for budgets; they have no lawful power over departmental matters. They're simply overpaid political operatives, whom we can't afford.

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Enough.
At a time when our libraries, swimming pools, and bus routes are being cut back, the Mayor quietly is hiring more and more high-paid political assistants.
Passing this measure is an important step in fighting back.

James Fang, BART Director
Michael Bernick, BART Director

After we began circulating petitions for voters' signatures, Mayor Agnos made cosmetic changes in his seven "Deputy Mayor" positions. While only one "Deputy Mayor" now carries the title, two former "Deputy Mayors" have kept their same salaries, and the others are still around but have been moved and awarded new titles. Elimination of these positions will save approximately $1,000,000 per year. The Mayor will not go without help; in his budget there are 40 positions called "Assistants to the Mayor," earning from $36,452 to $86,684. There are an additional 81 positions in the Mayor's budget, not affected by Proposition H.

When Agnos became Mayor in January, 1987, there were 102 positions in the Mayor's Office at a cost of approximately $3,800,000. Now his office costs approximately $6,100,000 and is staffed by 124 people!

Discounting positions in the Mayor's Office funded from state and federal sources, there were 82 exclusively city-funded positions in the Mayor's Office in 1990, while there were just 21 in San Jose, a larger city. How would you like to be a city department head, accountable under the Charter to a Commission or to the Chief Administrative Officer, but having to answer also to an illegitimate "Deputy Mayor" or some similarly titled person? Can you imagine the state of your morale?

Don't be fooled by the "Agnos shuffle." Vote "YES" on H.

Cheryl Arenson  Mary A. Lohneis
Dorothy M. Patridge  Irene H. Patridge
Martha E. Nilan  Robert Barnes

FOR THE COST OF THESE POLITICAL CRONIES, THINK WHAT WE COULD PROVIDE FOR STUDENTS, LIBRARIES, AND HEALTH CARE. SHAME ON AGNOS!

Rich Bodisco, Chair
S.F. For Reasonable Reform
Rick Fenton, A Concerned Citizen

This caps the fat salaries paid to the mayor's political associates. These patronage jobs violate the public trust. The mayor could use the same money to hire a dozen physicians to staff my HIV Early Intervention Centers proposal, and care for 10,000 HIV patients. Or staff our neighborhood libraries, keep our streets clean, or (fill-in the blank).
As San Francisco's next mayor, I will clean house and end the big-salary giveaway.

Richard D. Hongisto, Mayoral Candidate

There exists in City Hall a pernicious practice by the Mayor of designating certain extravagantly paid personnel as Deputy Mayors. The City Charter contains no legitimate authorization for any such position, but the Mayor established seven so-called Deputy Mayors, drawing salaries as high as $103,000 per year. With health and other benefits and assistants, there's been a cost to taxpayers of over $1,000,000 annually. That doesn't include overhead. The Grand Jury last year denounced Mayor Agnos' practice and called his office "over-staffed given the population and budget of the city." Its report found that "six of the Deputy Mayors are paid $94,458, " one other Deputy Mayor "is paid ... $102,500;" the Civil Service Commission has not received information detailing the duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Mayors (nor of the 45 Assistants to the Mayor;) and that the Deputy Mayors "are not held accountable for specific operational areas of responsibility ... yet their salaries exceed those of some of the department heads who oversee and are accountable for large budgets and departments;" The Grand Jury additionally discovered: "... the San Francisco Mayor's Office, when compared to Mayor's offices in other combined governments ... has the largest budget, the largest number of employees and pay the highest top salary." Moreover, the Grand Jury certified that "witnesses cited occasions when a Deputy Mayor has put the need to enhance or protect the political image of the Mayor above the needs of the city."

The Mayor has 124 people under his thumb and "Deputy Mayors" duplicate already authorized positions. They're wasteful. The city's limited funds must be used for health, police, fire and other services to San Francisco, not for political patronage. Vote YES on H.

Thomas G. Dempsey  Martha M. Gillham
John Riordan  Daniel G. Gillham
Albert L. Powers  Dorothy L. Powers

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

When the then incumbent left the Mayor’s office in 1975 there were 57 people working there. Back then it cost $1,600,000 to run the Mayor’s office. Today under Art Agnos there are 124 people in the Mayor’s office at a cost to taxpayers of over $6,000,000. Why should there be twice as many people in Room 200 today as there were 16 years ago? And why should the Mayor’s office, factoring in inflation, cost over twice as much to run as it did 16 years ago? It shouldn’t and that’s why a citizen initiative to ban Deputy Mayors collected over 57,000 signatures to put it on the ballot.

Some will argue that because more state and federal money is used to pay for the cost of the Mayor’s office that everything is “ok”, but that’s malarkey as a look at your pay stub shows. Whatever the source the taxpayer is still stuck with a fat bill. What is the City receiving for these $100,000 Deputy Mayors? Not much. According to the Grand Jury Report they do political things for Art Agnos. So, let’s restore some common sense to City Hall by banning Deputy Mayors.

VOTE “YES” ON “H”.

Marian F. Corbett
Dan Dunnigan
Abbie F. Airo

Corrinne Arenson
Clifford J. DuRand
Barbara M. Zerhusen

In January 1990 I initiated a formal review of Mayor Agnos’ deputy mayor system. Since then, our Budget Analyst and Civil Grand Jury have found that the deputy mayor system is a bloated, inefficient way of doing business.

I urge you to vote for Proposition H so we can restore accountability to the Mayor’s office. Fancy titles and huge salaries only create the illusion of leadership. San Franciscans deserve better than that!

Vote yes on Proposition H!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The purpose of Proposition H is to end the sorry spectacle of the creation by ANY MAYOR of bureaucrats with fancy titles, such as “Deputy Mayor.” The best Mayor in modern San Francisco history, George Christopher, never had a Deputy Mayor. He obeyed the Charter, appointing people only to those positions authorized by it. In the Alioto administration, one person arrogated to himself the title of “Deputy Mayor”. People laughed about it on the then Board of Supervisors, never thinking it was a serious effort to destroy the Charter or cost taxpayers unjustified money, particularly because that individual occupied the Charter-authorized position of “Executive Deputy”. Thereafter, however, the illegitimate practice increased through the next two administrations, reaching a climax with the current mayor, who within a year of taking office, created seven (7) “Deputy Mayor” positions, with ultimate salaries of over $100,000 plus fringe benefits and immense associated additional costs to taxpayers. Sensing that this voter initiative would qualify for the ballot, this Mayor now tries to distract voters by claiming abolition of the positions. While the titles have been changed, the employees remain, at virtually the same salaries and auxiliary costs. As shown by the Budget Analyst’s review of the current City budget, the seven “Deputy Mayors” have been hidden under different names in City Hall crevices. Proposition H uproots and disposes of them, at a resultant savings of approximately $1,000,000 per year to taxpayers. Don’t be fooled by the “shell game”; vote YES on H.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

The Agnos system of seven deputy mayors — now with new titles, but still averaging nearly $100,000 a year — is a waste of your money.

An effective mayor controls the heads of each department, so why should the mayor need expensive deputy mayors to manage his own department heads?

There will be only one chief of staff in an Alioto administration.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!
We believe that the Mayor is elected to manage and staff the
Mayor’s office as he or she sees fit. The Mayor needs management
flexibility to solve the City’s complex problems. If we do not like
the way the City is run, we must elect new officials, not tie the
hands of government.
Vote NO on Proposition H!
Andy Nash
Peter Moylan
Charlene Clarke
Norm Rolfe
Bernie Choden
Jack Morrison
San Francisco Tomorrow

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

BAN DEPUTY MAYORS
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO
CHARTER SECTION 3.100 BY ADDING
NEW SECTIONS 3.100-3 BANNING AP-
POINTMENTS TO THE POSITION OF DEP-
UTY TO THE MAYOR OR TO POSITIONS
KNOWN AS DEPUTY MAYOR.
NOTE: This entire section is new.
Be it ordained by the people of the City and
County of San Francisco:
San Francisco Charter Section 3.100 is
amended and modified by adding Section 3.100-3
reading as follows:
Section 3.100-3 Prohibiting Deputy Mayors.
Notwithstanding any other provisions or limi-
tations of this charter to the contrary, the mayor
may not designate nor may the city and county
employ on the mayor’s behalf any person to act
as deputy to the mayor or any similar employ-
ment classification, regardless of title, whose
responsibilities include but are not necessarily
limited to supervision of the administration of
any department for which the chief administra-
tive officer, an elected official other than the
mayor or an appointed board or commission is
assigned responsibility elsewhere in this charter;
nor may any employee in the office of the mayor
be compensated at a level in excess of seventy
percent of the compensation paid to the mayor
under the salary standardization provisions of
this charter.
This section shall take effect on the first day of
January of the year following its approval by the
voters of the city and county.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Appointment of Minors to Boards

PROPOSITION I
Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?

YES \ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City wants to include people under 18 on certain boards, commissions and advisory bodies. At this time, you must be a San Francisco resident and an elector to be appointed to any of these groups. To be an elector, you must be at least 18 years old and eligible to register to vote.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments. Persons under 18 when appointed would be required to become electors when they reached 18.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow persons under 18 to be appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body when the law creating that body provides for such appointments.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the requirement that persons appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body be 18 or older.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On July 22, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This Charter Amendment would allow young people under 18 to serve on boards, commissions and advisory bodies when the Board of Supervisors has specifically provided for their participation. Currently San Francisco youth under 18 are excluded from participating on the advisory boards and commissions which forge policies for our youth in San Francisco.

The Delinquency Prevention Commission, for example, currently provides two seats for youth under 18. These seats are unfilled because of the Charter requirement that members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies must be electors.

In order for the City to address the changing needs and realities of young people, it is important that San Francisco amend its policy and adopt a system in which the voices of young people are an integral part of decisions which affect their lives and future. Surely there is no more effective voice for the youth than youth.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The argument of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor for this measure cleverly ignores the point: they ask us to amend our Charter to create a fiction, namely, that people under 18 are electors, when they legally are not. They do so under the guise of eligibility for membership on a board or commission. It used to be that you had to be a voter to participate in policy decisions of boards or commissions of city government. In fact, it still is. That's what the Charter requires and for good reason. Commissioners are accountable; they exercise legal responsibility. That's why the law requires them to be electors. Proposition I resembles that line in "Alice in Wonderland" where Tweedledee explains to Alice: "if it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic."

We urge you to reject a legalistically contrived ballot measure by voting "NO" on Proposition I.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

While this proposal seems well intentioned, it is nonsensical public policy to treat minors as electors (when they are not) so as to serve as city commissioners.

There surely are enough well qualified electors who are willing and able to serve on city boards and commissions without drafting minors to do so. While we wholeheartedly support the concept of encouraging teenagers to be involved in governmental issues, it is a fiction to call them electors so they can be given the awesome responsibility of a commissioner. We should listen to their thoughts and ideas, but people under 18 should not be placed in a contrived position as electors to formulate public policy. Common sense urges that you vote NO on Proposition I.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The issue raised by Proposition I is not the availability of qualified electors but fairness in government. Proposition I does not declare teenagers to be electors. Rather it provides that on certain governmental bodies young people should have a voice. The only body presently so constituted is the Delinquency Prevention Commission.

Placing young people in positions of leadership is not contrived. It is a respectful and practical approach to public policy and a recognition that age and wisdom are not mutually exclusive.

This legislation would have no application to the powerful boards and commissions created under the Charter. It would only apply to governmental bodies created by the Board of Supervisors where participation by persons under 18 is expressly deemed helpful to the City as well as to its young people.

This is a good government issue.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Our youth have the intelligence and ability to help shape public policy on the issues that affect their lives. Boards and commissions that determine how the City reaches out to help our youth must have input from the youth themselves in order to have any chance of success.

Join me in voting YES on Proposition I.

 Supervisor Angela Alioto

Voices of young people should be heard in City Hall. Too often adults do all of the talking and none of the listening. This measure allows young people to be appointed to those positions that have been designated for them — but which can’t be filled now because of a Catch-22 in the Charter. This fixes that. Vote “yes”.

 Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof, providing that minors may be appointed by the board of supervisors to boards, commissions or advisory bodies created by legislation of the board of supervisors if the legislation allows the appointment of minors to the board, commission or advisory body.

The Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county and an elector thereof immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, if a board, commission or advisory body is established by a legislative act which provides that any member or members of the board, commission or advisory body may be under the age of 18 years, then appointees to serve on the board, commission or advisory body in positions in which the original legislative act allows persons under the age of 18 to serve shall be residents, but need not be electors until they have attained the age of 18. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City be required to create a Children's Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for services for children is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on services for children.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment. For 10 years, the City would be required to place a certain part of its property tax revenues in a Children's Fund. This Fund would pay for additional services for children under 18. In the first year, the amount would be 1-1/4 cents for each $100 of assessed property value; for the next 9 years the portion would be 2-1/2 cents.

The Fund could only be spent on children's services as follows: child care, job readiness, training and placement programs, social services (including prenatal services to pregnant adult women), educational programs, recreation, delinquency prevention and library services. For the first 4 years, at least 25% of the Fund would be used for childcare, at least 25% for job training and placement, and at least 25% for health and social services. Beginning with the fifth year, the Board of Supervisors could change or eliminate these minimums.

The measure prohibits using the Fund for certain purposes, including services which benefit children only indirectly. The City would be prohibited from reducing spending for children's services below what it spent in 1990-91 or 1991-92, whichever is higher. Money in the Fund could be used only to increase spending for children's services.

Each year, after public hearings, the Mayor would send to the Board of Supervisors a Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to place a certain amount of the City's property tax revenues in a Fund to provide additional services for children under 18.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this Fund.
Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand specific children’s services as set forth in the measure, mandate the current level of spending on children’s services with prescribed escalation factors, and require certain administrative tasks to be done by various boards, commissions and the Controller.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to children’s programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures. In addition, since this initiative prohibits the use of these funds for the operations and maintenance of recreation & park, library and hospital facilities, even if used for expanded children’s programs, supplementary general fund monies may be required to support these expanded programs.

Based on 1991-92 budgets and property tax assessments, approximately $5.7 million in 1992-93, $13.2 million in 1993-94, and $14.0 million in 1994-95, and increasing thereafter with the rate of increase in assessed values of city properties until 2001-2002, would be reallocated by this measure.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition J to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 51,140 of the signatures were valid, 10,425 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The condition of children in San Francisco — all children, of all colors and all economic classes — is deteriorating, sometimes to crisis proportions.

The crisis is inhumane and expensive. Lives are being destroyed. All our futures are in jeopardy, even though prevention is less costly and more effective than trying to repair broken lives.

Proposition J, The Children’s Amendment, is the result of three year’s work by 60 child-serving agencies, The Children’s Budget Coalition — many of which are not funded in any way by city funds.

Year after year, Coalition members watched the children’s percentage of the City budget decline. They concluded that:

Without special protections, children will continue to be victims in the annual budget wars conducted by adults.
Children can’t vote, lobby or contribute to political campaigns. As a result their needs are often ignored.

Proposition J requires that special protections for children be written into the City Charter — as Child Labor laws have written special protections into state and federal law. It provides a minimum guarantee for funding for children’s programs: a minimum guarantee for prevention and enrichment, rather than abuse, unemployment, prison and disease.

The Children’s Fund, created by Proposition J, would only constitute approximately .5% (one half of one percent) of the total city budget.

Proposition J makes significant improvements without new taxes or bureaucracies, by re-ordering city priorities and coordinating services provided by a dozen city departments.

Because children are the next generation, Proposition J is a guarantee for the future of us all.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR CHILDREN, VOTE FOR THE FUTURE. VOTE FOR OURSELVES.

Margaret Brodtkin, Director
Greg Day, President
Jean Jacobs, Founder
Coleman Advocates for Children

Yori Wada, Board of Regents, U.C.*
Michael Shaw, Black Leadership Forum*

Art Tapia, Sergeant, SFPD*, Chair
Alicia Wang, Treasurer
Children’s Amendment Campaign

* For identification only

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is not as simple or easy as its sponsors say. While not disputing the validity of their contentions about children’s problems, other groups in San Francisco have major problems, including the elderly, the mentally ill, the physically disabled, the unemployed, the sick and infirm, Muni Railway riders, blighted neighborhoods. Proposition J is a flawed, simplistic way to address children’s problems. It limits the discretion of elected representatives to expend General Fund revenues and affects seriously the city’s ability to balance future budgets by reducing available tax dollars. Like to the Open Space Fund, it diverts property tax collections for one group at the expense of others. What group will be next to obtain the same diversion of property tax collections? Its robbing Peter to pay Paul. A pending state measure would provide substantial additional money for the General Fund and children’s services, by conforming state tax codes to Proposition 13 requirements and reappraising large-corporation property in San Francisco upon changes in majority stock ownership. That creates more money for children’s services in San Francisco, without taking money from police, fire, health, library or elderly services.

Finally, the money Proposition J diverts from property tax collections will soon be all that city government allocates to children’s services. The “minimum guarantee” mentioned by the sponsors will become the maximum, like the lottery for education. That’s human nature. I don’t want the “floor” to be the “ceiling” and that’s why I’m voting “NO” on “J”.

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Proposition J is another seductive, but delterious, concept, fostered specially for a particular segment of society. Who can argue against providing money for the needs of children? Obviously, we love our children and want to aid them as necessary. But, Proposition J is not the way to do it. It is a fiscal “gimmick”, which takes two and one-half cents per $100 assessed property valuation and sequesters it in a special fund. It raises no extra money for children’s services; it reduces the amount of money which might be needed more from time to time for the elderly, for hospital and library facilities and recreation and parks.

Already, San Francisco’s budget has been adversely affected for nearly 17 years by diversion of property tax revenue to remove private property from the tax rolls for “open space”. This measure includes escalation factors which would divert $13,200,000 from the General Fund by 1993, and thereafter divert an increasing sum at a rate of approximately 9% per year. Proposition J mandates services without providing a realistic method of paying. Earmarking a fixed percentage of the City budget for any purpose is terrible public policy. Meeting its requirements will inevitably cause cuts in other services like law enforcement and health care for the elderly. If this passes, effective governance by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors will become even more excruciatingly difficult. That’s why I’m voting against Proposition J, even if other elected public officials in San Francisco won’t admit they’d like to tell you to do so also. Vote “NO” on J.

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Protecting children is not a “gimmick.” There is no gimmickry in being able to say “yes” to mothers needing childcare so they can return to work, or “yes” to teenagers needing special training to get jobs.

Opponents to J object to “diverting” a tiny percent of the city budget (.5%) to children. They want to continue the politics-as-usual budget process. That process has utterly failed children. Failed to provide even the most basic services — like immunizations from disease, safe afterschool programs, and adequate library books. Children cannot cut budget “deals” to get their fair share. They are the one group for whom special budget protections are essential.

Spending an additional one-half of 1% of the budget on children will not prevent San Francisco from meeting other critical needs. It saves money to invest in developing a law-abiding, healthy, qualified younger generation. How could proponents of greater efficiency in government argue that such efficiency is not possible when it comes to finding funds for our children?

The Children’s Fund will only increase at the same rate as city revenues. The so-called “escalating factor” merely controls for inflation.

San Franciscans have understood the unique vulnerability of children. They have not been swayed by divisive rhetoric that pits one group against another. Read the arguments that follow. Seniors, police officers, law enforcement officials, gay and lesbian leaders, environmentalists and members of every neighborhood all agree: Protecting children is enlightened, farsighted public policy.

Yori Wada
Michael Shaw
Jean Jacobs
Ari Tapia

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

It is undeniable that children's services are underfunded. The ongoing financial cutbacks from the state and federal government threaten to aggravate the situation.

Because children cannot vote, the electorate must insulate children's services from the political process. The Children's Amendment will protect children's programs and guarantee that children remain a top priority no matter who is in office.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Children deserve a special place in the city's budget. Legally they can't vote or speak for themselves. This measure gives them the claim on city funds that they need. I have analyzed our city funds and am confident we can deliver what Proposition J asked for without hurting other people. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

In 1989, I introduced legislation to create a Children's Budget for San Francisco, but the mayor refused to allocate the money. Now, the mayor is jumping on the bandwagon, but it is not enough to care about children only in an election year.

I have fought every year for budgeting that starts with the neediest: our children.

Twenty-three percent of our children under five live in poverty. We need better health services for children, more day care options, job training and programs for abused children. These must be our top priority.

Vote YES on Proposition J.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

I am proud to have been the first public official to endorse the Children's Amendment.

As former sheriff, I understand the need for prevention services to reach out to our young people. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors, it's clear to me that children cannot compete with the special interests that dominate City budget debates.

Our children are shortchanged. Proposition J is a necessary framework to end this injustice, and care for our children. As a parent, as a children's advocate, I respectfully urge your vote for Proposition J.

Richard D. Honigsto
Mayoral Candidate

In the politics-as-usual process of the San Francisco city budget, children are especially vulnerable. They are too small to hire lobbyists, make campaign contributions, and cut deals.

Now, San Francisco's children are in the midst of a worsening crisis: child abuse in San Francisco is up 400% over the last ten years; there are 8,000 kids on the waiting list for child-care; 23% of all mothers in San Francisco have poor and inadequate pre-natal care.

We support Proposition J, to amend the San Francisco Charter to provide a minimum guarantee for funding children's programs.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Evelyn Wilson, Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee
Jennifer Clary, Richmond District Democratic Club
Dorice Murphy, President, Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Joe O'Donoghue, President, SF Residential Builders Association
Sue Hestor
Carol Kocivar
Calvin Welch
Dennis Antenore
"Ramona" Albright, Twin Peaks Council & Open Space Conservancy*
Gene Coleman
"Irish" Pat Lawlor

* For identification purposes only

Proposition J is good government and sound fiscal policy. Proposition J does not raise taxes. It creates a Children's Fund by utilizing existing resources. It requires the city to reallocate approximately one percent of the city's General Fund, less than half of one percent of the overall city budget, to children's services. This can be done without a reduction in other city services if the city government would allocate and expend funds with greater efficiency. The Children's Amendment will be one more pressure point on the city to improve its financial management, and the children of the city will benefit.

Setting aside a portion of the budget to meet critical needs is standard budget practice. It is already done for the arts, for seniors and for open space purchases, to name a few. It certainly makes sense to provide a similar guarantee for our children.

Investing in children is the wisest investment the city can make, one of the best possible uses of public revenues.

Victor Honig, CPA
Roland Quan, CPA

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

SAN FRANCISCO'S CHILDREN FACE A SERIOUS CRISIS:

• Children on waiting list for day-care — 8,000
• Child Abuse — UP 400%, 1980 – 1990
• Children without health coverage — UP 300% 1985 – 1990
• Homeless children and youth — 5,000 each year
• Mothers without adequate pre-natal care — 23%
• High School dropouts — 1,500 per year

Proposition J, The Children's Amendment, will continue existing programs, and, with no new taxes, provide enough money to:

Provide childcare for 1,000 additional children;

and

Establish mental health and family support centers to prevent child abuse;

and

Provide pre-natal care for all expectant mothers currently without care;

and

Bring library purchases of children’s books up to the same level as Oakland, and expand library hours for children;

and

Provide jobs and job training for 1,500 youths;

and

Provide after-school recreation programs, tutoring programs, AIDS prevention, school-based health-care and more.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Asian Childcare Coalition,
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Ctr
Booker T. Washington Center
Camp Fire Boys/Girls
Catholic Charities, SF
Catholic Youth Organization
Central City Hospitality House
Children’s Council/Childcare Switchboard
Children’s Law Offices
Children Now
Children’s Self-Help Center
Coleman Advocates
Family School

Family Service Agency, SF
Gay/Lesbian Youth Advocates
Grandparents Who Care
Haight-Ashbury Play Program
Income Rights Project
Japanese Community Youth Council
Jewish Family/Children’s Services
La Casa de las Madres
Legal Services for Children
Maternal Child/Adolescent Health Board
Mission Reading Clinic
Morrissania West
Mothers/Fathers of Concern
Omega Boys Club
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
SF Association for Education of Young Children
SF Boys/Girls Club
SF Child Abuse Council
SF Headstart (Far West Laboratory)
SF Parents Lobby
SF PTA
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Visitacion Valley Community Center
Visitacion Valley Parents for Youth
Wu Yee Children’s Services
Young Community Developers
Youth Advocates/Huckleberry House
Youth Employment Coalition
Youth Law Center
YWCA

The best way to reduce crime is to prevent it. Taking care of our children is the smartest, most cost-effective way to keep our youth out of the criminal justice system. That’s why we as police officers urge you to vote yes on The Children’s Amendment.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

Every day, we deal with the tragic human and financial costs of failing to take preventative action to help the City’s children live safe, honest and productive lives.

The City currently pays over $30,000 a year to keep a juvenile in a correctional facility — in addition to the cost to the public of his/her crimes or misdemeanors. It would cost only $2,800 a year to provide both job training and after school recreation.

The City currently pays $2,000 a day for neo-natal intensive care for crack babies. It would cost only $125 a day to provide a drug program for a pregnant teenager.

The City currently pays $15,000 a year to keep an abused or neglected child in a foster home. It would cost only $3,000 a year to provide a family with comprehensive mental health and support services.

We believe it is both humane and economical to pay now for health-care, child-care and youth training, rather than pay later for welfare, psychiatric hospitals and prisons.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender

We are committed to the education of San Francisco’s children and we believe the Children’s Amendment will greatly enhance our ability to educate our children. Since Proposition 13, our public schools have had to cut sports, social workers, nurses, libraries, childcare, vocational services and after-school programs.

The Children’s Amendment will help the schools by providing funding for many of the services the school district desperately needs, but can no longer afford to support.

Tom Ammiano
Carola del Portillo
Libby Denebeim
Dan Kelly
Joanne Miller
Fred Rodriguez
Leland Yee
Members, SF Board of Education
Members, SF Community College Board

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala
Robert Burton
William Marquis, Ph.D.
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Tim Wofred, Ph.D.
Robert Varni

Ramon Cortines, Superintendent, SFUSD
Evan Dobelle, EdD, Chancellor, SF Community College
Diana Schindler, President, SF PTA
Jill Wynns, President, SF Parents’ Lobby

San Francisco’s children live in the shadows of some of the world’s most renowned and advanced medical institutions. Yet, the overall health status of our children is appalling. Almost half of our two-year-olds are not adequately immunized; a quarter of our pregnant mothers do not get adequate prenatal care; and our adolescents have one of the highest rates of sexually transmitted disease in the country. The number of children hospitalized at the state psychiatric facility has tripled in the past ten years. The Children’s Amendment will enable San Francisco to more effectively reach out to our children with appropriate care, care that will keep our children strong and healthy and able to lead productive lives.

Abraham Rudolph, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, UCSF*
Philip Zeiring, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics/Pacific Campus, California Pacific Medical Center
Moses Grossman, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, UCSF
Martin Gershman, M.D., Chairman, California District of American Academy of Pediatrics
Paul Kulp, R.N., M.S., Golden Gate Nurses Association
Anita De Frantz, PhD., Maternal Child & Adolescent Health Board

*For identification purposes only

Ensuring minimum funding for City services is a desperate measure, but these are desperate times.

In the 1991-1992 budget, the Mayor and Supervisors raised MUNI fares and residential parking fees and slashed vital health and safety services while rewarding real estate speculators and out-of-town corporations and preserving pork-barrel “perks” like luxury Candlestick boxes for the politically connected.

Such regressive policies are expected, coming out of Washington and Sacramento, but when they are adopted by our own leaders, the voters must take a stand to preserve our most important resource, our children.

After all, who do these politicians expect to pay the taxes to support their salaries in the 21st Century if we fail to educate our young people to compete in the global economy. The Germans and Japanese? Robots?

Vote YES on Proposition J!

North Mission Association
David Spero, President
Brian Doohan

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

We in the African American community are concerned about the disproportionate harmful impact on our community that results from the lack of a preventative focus in public policy. It is unconscionable that African Americans have the highest infant mortality rate and the largest representation in both the foster care and the juvenile justice systems. It is unacceptable for mothers who want to work to be unable to find affordable childcare.

Proposition J is the beginning of what we feel is a rational approach to addressing some of the unmet health, childcare and employment needs in our community.

Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Doris Ward
Dr. Amos Brown, Third Baptist Church
Reverend Cecil Williams, Glide Memorial Church
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Sharen Hewitt, Coalition for an African American Community Agenda
Anita De Frantz, Ph.D., National Black Child Development Institute
Lulanne McGriff, NAACP, San Francisco
Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
George Newkirk
Michael Shaw, Taxpayer
Ronald Colthrust, Office of Assemblyman John Burton
Espanola Jackson, District 7 Democratic Club

The Children’s Amendment is good business. Money spent on having healthy, educated productive children is not an expense. It is the best investment this city can make. As leaders of the business community, we know that the economic security of this country is in jeopardy because too many of our children are not prepared to enter the labor market. The Children’s Amendment will fund critical job training programs for our youth. This training will allow our youth to move into the workforce, where they will be productive and pay taxes, rather than become dependent. Businesses have to be competitive if the U.S. economy is to stay healthy . . . and businesses need to be vigilant about controlling costs if they are to be competitive. But nowhere in that equation can we forget our responsibility — individual and institution alike — to our children.

For the sake of our future, support The Children’s Amendment.

Elliot Hoffman, Just Desserts
Louis Giraudo, Chairman & CEO, SF French Bread Co.
Stanley Herzstein, Chairman, World Trade Center of SF
Terese Dicks Payne, Senior Managing Director, Bear Sterns
Sue Danielson, Small Business Commission
Russell Kassman, Small Business Commission, Owner — Kassman Piano
Jerome Dodson, The Parnassus Fund
Edward Farrah, School Apparel, Inc.
Robert Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co.*
Lawrence Simi, Businessman

Change the world of a child, and you change the world. As elected officials, we know that children often get the short end of the stick because they lack political clout. Children need the kind of special protection afforded to them by Proposition J, The Children’s Amendment. Kids can’t vote, but you can!

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J.

Richard Sanchez, MD, Health Commissioner*
James Morales, Planning Commission*
Roberto Hernandez, Recreation & Park Commissioner*
Robert Sanchez, Small Business Commissioner*
Robert Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co.*
Edward Farrah, Business Executive
Mike Garza, Businessman
Maria Acosta Colon, Director, Mexican Museum
Rene de la Rosa, KIJI

*For identification purposes only
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Because they can’t vote San Francisco’s children do poorly each year in our city’s budget process. Our lesbian, gay and bisexual youth lack basic support services and are at great risk of suicide, violence, AIDS, dropping out of school and becoming homeless ‘throwaways.’ The Children’s Amendment will preserve minimum funding for all children and provide funding for new programs that could be used to help our youth and other underserved children.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Harry Britt
Tom Ammiano, Board of Education
Tim Wolfred, College Board
Gay & Lesbian Youth Advocates
Lavender Youth Recreation & Information Center
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Richard Allman
TJ. Anthony
Robert Barnes
Ray Benson
Paul Boneberg
Mike Bosia
Barbara Cameron
Eric Ciasullo
Greg Day
Mary Dunlap
Roma Guy
Jean Harris

Ken Jones
Hoover Lee
Phyllis Lyon
Del Martin
Paul Melbostad
Brandy Moore
Pat Norman
Donna Ozawa
Melinda Paras
Diana Phillips
Maggi Rubenstein
Chris Sandoval
Thomas Steel
Judith E. Stevenson
Lily Gee Hickman
K.Tsenin
Carmen Vasquez
John Wilhite
Reggie Williams
Hank Wilson
Lawrence Wong
Richmond Young

Children are everyone’s future. If we fail to invest in our children now, both their future and ours may well be troubled, expensive, and unproductive. The Children’s Amendment will require city government to make children, to make the future, a priority.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition J.

Douglas Chan, President, Lawrence Wong, Vice President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Vincent Chao, School Principal
Claudine Cheng, National President, Organization of Chinese Americans*
Dr. Yoon Chey, Executive Director, Korean Multi-Services Center*
Victor Hsi
Ray Ibay, SFPD*
Hoover Lee
Jeff Mori, Community Youth Council
Sulalagi Palega, Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club
Rodel E. Rodis, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, President, SF Community College Governing Board
Nogaluma Tuisasopo, Samoa Mo Samoa
Vu-Duc Vuong, Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Alan Wong
Harold Yee, President, Asian Inc.
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Children’s Services

*For identification purposes only

As environmentalists we support The Children’s Amendment to protect our most important natural resource — the children. Ecology issues are human issues. We can’t protect future generations, if we don’t save the very next generation, today’s children.

Green Party of California
San Francisco Tomorrow

We cannot live and work for a better future and, at the same time, neglect our children. Our children are the future, and without our efforts now, our future may be both bitter and bleak. As US Senator Daniel Moynihan has warned us: “The US today may be the first society in history where the children are much worse off than adults.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR THE FUTURE.

Robert Morales, Teamsters, Local 350
United Educators of San Francisco
SEIU, Local 535 — Social Services Union
Shirley Black
Michael Hardenman, Labor Leader
Upholstery Division, Local 3-U, USWA

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Children's Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Eight thousand children are currently on waiting lists for childcare in San Francisco.
Twenty-three percent of all expectant mothers receive poor or inadequate pre-natal care.
Every day, 1,800 women and children are fed from soup lines at Glide Memorial Church and St. Anthony's Dining Room.
Child abuse is San Francisco has risen over 400% in the last five years.

Proposition J, The Children's Amendment, will provide increased child-care, increased pre-natal care, family mental health and support centers, expanded library and after-school recreation programs.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

San Francisco Chapter, National Organization for Women Bay Area Women's Resource Center

We can truly be a voice for the voiceless right here in our own City if we support The Children's Amendment. We now have a whole generation of children we have failed. The Children's Amendment will help make the City become a loving involved mother to all of its children. Help make San Francisco child-friendly. All families benefit from better recreation centers, child-care centers, libraries, health-care and social services.

Vote yes on Proposition J.

George Wesolek, Executive Director, Justice & Peace Commission, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Sister Glenn Anne McPhee, Office of Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Catholic Charities of San Francisco
Catholic Youth Organization

The most important obligation of each generation is to see that the next generation is prepared to carry on in its place. Vote to protect our future San Franciscans.

VOTE FOR THE CHILDREN'S AMENDMENT, PROPOSITION J.

Grandparents Who Care
Gray Panthers of San Francisco
Senior Action Network

A society cannot survive if it does not provide care for its children. The San Francisco Democratic Party urges all San Franciscans of every party to provide for the future now by supporting our children and grandchildren this November.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Kimiko Burton, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Ellen Chaiin, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Michael Hardeman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
John Figone, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steven Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Chair of the Finance Committee, I am fully aware of the city’s fiscal problems. But I am also a parent, a former teacher, and I am deeply committed to making San Francisco an excellent place to raise children.

The budget situation for San Francisco will be difficult next year, but after that, it is projected to improve: state and federal funds are forthcoming to address law enforcement and healthcare needs and we can continue to cut bureaucratic costs. Finding an additional .5% of the general fund budget for children will not be easy, but it can be done.

FOR CHILDREN’S SAKE, VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J provides no answers to any funding problems that affect San Francisco’s children; it makes yearly budgeting even more difficult.

Vote "NO" on Proposition J

This measure would skim “from the top” 2-1/2% of the revenues from property taxes for the next ten years. The earmarking of public funds is shortsighted public policy because it deprives our public officials of the ability to adapt revenues to the ever-changing needs of the city. The money that would fund children’s programs cannot be reallocated in the future for other critical services such as law enforcement, health care for the elderly, AIDS, mental health and other basic programs.

On the face of it this may sound like a great idea, but the reality is that Proposition J provides no extra money to San Francisco’s coffers to address the diverse needs of our city.

Let’s not make promises we can’t keep. Vote "NO" on Proposition J.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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

NOTE: This entire section is new.
San Francisco Charter Section 6.415
6.415 Children’s Fund
(a) There is hereby established a fund to ex-
pand children’s services, which shall be called
the San Francisco Children’s Fund and shall be
maintained separate and apart from all other city
and county funds and appropriated by annual or
supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections
6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein
shall be expended or used solely to provide ex-
panded services for children as provided in this
section.
(b) There is hereby set aside for the San Fran-
cisco Children’s Fund, from the revenues of the
tax levy pursuant to Section 6.208 of this charter,
revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual
tax of one-and-one-quarter cents ($0.0125) for
each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed
valuation for the first fiscal year which begins
ninety days or more after the election which
approves this section, and revenues equivalent to
an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025)
for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of as-
essed valuation for each of the following nine
fiscal years. The treasurer shall set aside and
maintain said amount, together with any interest
earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts
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
limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated
then or thereafter for the purposes specified in
this section.
(c) Monies in the fund shall be used exclu-
sively to provide services to children less than
eighteen years old, above and beyond services
funded prior to adoption of this section. To this
end, monies from the fund shall not be appropri-
atated or expended to fund services provided dur-
ing fiscal year 1991-1992, whether or not the cost
of such services increases, or appropriated or
expended for services which substitute for or
replace services provided during fiscal year
1990-1991 or 1991-1992, except solely to the
extent of services for which the City ceased
to receive federal, state, or private agency funds
which the funding agency required to be spent
only on the services in question.
(d) Services for children eligible for fund as-
sistance shall include only child care; job readi-
ness, training and placement programs; health
and social services (including pre-natal services
to pregnant adult women); educational programs;
recreation; delinquency prevention; and library
services, in each case for children. Services for
children paid for by the fund shall not include:
(1) for example and not for purposes of limita-
tion, services provided by the police department
or other law enforcement agencies; by courts,
the district attorney, public defender or city attorney;
by the fire department; detention or probation
services mandated by state or federal law; or
public transportation;
(2) any service which benefits children inci-
dently or as members of a larger population
including adults;
(3) any service for which a fixed or minimum
level of expenditure is mandated by state or fed-
eral law, to the extent of the fixed or minimum
level of expenditure;
(4) acquisition of any capital item not for pri-
mary and direct use by children;
(5) acquisition other than by lease for a term
of ten years or less of any real property or
(6) maintenance, utilities or any similar oper-
ating cost of any facility not used primarily and
directly by children, or of any recreation or park
facility (including a zoo), library facility or hos-
pital.
(e) During each fiscal year, a minimum of
twenty five percent (25%) of said fund shall be
used for child care, a minimum of twenty five
percent (25%) for job readiness, training and
placement and a minimum of twenty five percent
(25%) for health and social services for children
(including pre-natal services for pregnant adult
women). Beginning with the fifth fiscal year
during which funds are set aside under this sec-
tion, the Board of Supervisors may modify or
eliminate these minimum requirements.
(f) Not later than three months after the election
which approves this section and not later than
December of each calendar year which begins
after said election, the Mayor shall prepare and
present to the Board of Supervisors a Children’s
Services Plan. The plan shall propose goals and
objectives for the fund for the fiscal year begin-
nning the following July 1, propose expenditures
of monies from the fund for the fiscal year begin-
nning the following July 1 and designate the city
departments which would administer the funded
programs. In connection with preparation of the
Children’s Services Plan, and (except in connec-
tion with the first Children’s Services Plan) prior
to the date required for presentation to the Board,
the Health Commission, Juvenile Probation
Commission, Social Services Commission, Rec-
reation and Parks Commission and Public Li-
brary Commission shall each hold at least one
public hearing on the Plan. Joint hearings may be
held to satisfy this requirement. Any or all of the
commissions may also hold additional hearings
before or after presentation of the Plan.
(g) The fund shall be used exclusively to in-
crease the aggregate City appropriations and ex-
penditures for those services for children which
are eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of
expenditures mandated by state or federal law).
To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount
of such City appropriations for eligible services
(not including appropriations from the San Fran-
cisco Children’s Fund and exclusive of
expenditures mandated by state or federal law) in
any of the ten years during which funds are
required to be set aside under this section below
the higher of the amount so appropriated for the
fiscal year 1990-1991 or the amount so appropri-
atated for the fiscal year 1991-1992, in either case
as adjusted. Not later than three months after the
election which approves this section, the Con-
troller shall calculate and publish the applicable
base amount, specifying by department and pro-
gram each amount included in the base amount.
Said base amount shall be adjusted for each year
after the base year, based on calculations consis-
tent from year to year, by the percentage increase
or decrease in aggregate City appropriations
from the base year, as estimated by the Control-
ler. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropri-
ations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by an
adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For pur-
poses of this subsection, aggregate City appro-
priations shall not include funds granted to the
City by private agencies or appropriated by other
public agencies and received by the City. Within
ninety days following the end of each fiscal year
through 2001-2002, the Controller shall calcula-
te and publish the actual amount of City appro-
priations for services for children which are
eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of
expenditures mandated by state or federal law).
(h) If any provision of this section, or its appli-
cation to any person or circumstance, shall be
held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of
this section and its applications shall not be af-
ected; every provision of this section is intended
to be severable.
NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?
Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday, November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. on Election Day. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on Election Day.
Domestic Partners Repeal

PROPOSITION K
Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a "domestic partnership"?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: At the November 6, 1990 election San Francisco voters approved the Domestic Partners Ordinance. It allows two unmarried adults who live together and agree to share basic living expenses to establish formally their relationship as a domestic partnership. The Domestic Partners Ordinance also sets out procedures for establishing and ending a domestic partnership.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Domestic Partners Ordinance to remain in effect.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

If the Ordinance is repealed, in my opinion, it should not increase or decrease the cost of government.

How "K" Got on the Ballot
On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition K to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,320 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,921 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

“DOMESTIC PARTNERS” IS DISHONEST!
The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have betrayed the People! They promised domestic partners, (DP) would cost nothing, then immediately enacted benefits costing millions of dollars!

BAD FOR BUSINESS!
Under threats of litigation, businesses will be forced to pay higher benefits for DP s, a move that will surely drive more businesses out of San Francisco! . . . Or offer no benefits to any employee!

OFFENSIVE TO RELIGIONS!
Government sanctioned quasi-marriages continue to offend traditional cultural standards of Islam, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity. A small interest group puts its wants ahead of hundreds of generations; collective wisdom!
- Our whole system of laws and government is based upon concepts of right and wrong derived from biblical standards. In fact, “We hold these truths to be self-evident?” Religion is not the enemy of freedom and good government; tyrannical fanaticism is.

“DOMESTIC PARTNERS” IS ILLEGAL
Wrong approaches produce wrong results. If domestic partner-ship is good, why do insurers insist DPs are significantly more expensive to insure? Our City Charter, since 1972, has defined “dependent” as spouse and children. By what right is the Charter expanded to include DPs as dependents? Only the People have powers to amend the Charter of San Francisco!

DESTRUCTIVE of COMMUNITY!
- Faith in FAIR, HONEST GOVERNMENT is being destroyed by deceptive reporting of Health Service costs. The Mayor’s plan to shift The City’s AIDS funding onto the backs of City workers — especially RETIRED City workers! Despite efforts to conceal added costs to legitimate benefit plan members, rates have already gone up, shortfalls are being paid out of reserve funds, and there is no end in sight!
- Cynical domination of the well meaning majority by a greedy, minority in the name of “respect” destroys democratic goodwill!

VOTE YES ON K! REPEAL “DOMESTIC PARTNERS” ORDINANCE!

Gingmon Randolph
San Franciscans for Responsible Government

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The proponent of Proposition K implies that repealing the Domestic Partnership law will save businesses and the city money. That’s nonsense.

He makes this deceitful argument because he knows voters won’t accept his true purpose: to get rid of this cost-free law which lets couples who agree to care for each other register at City Hall.

The Domestic Partnership law has been on the books for a year. Not one business has been forced to pay higher benefits for domestic partners. That’s because the law doesn’t require anyone to provide any benefits to domestic partners.

Proposition K won’t save the City any health care costs either. That’s because Proposition K will have no effect on the City’s health plan at all. Proposition K repeals the law which allows domestic partners of city employees to buy coverage in the city’s health plan.

In fact, the City Controller’s official analysis of Prop. K says that it won’t save taxpayers a cent.

Allowing couples who agree to be legally responsible for each other to file a statement at City Hall is the least we can do to show respect for these important, vital relationships.

Keep the Domestic Partnership law.

Vote No On K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Britt.
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Since the voters passed the Domestic Partnership law last November, hundreds of San Francisco couples have shown their dedication to each other by registering as domestic partners. By doing that, they have made their commitment to care for each other both public and legally binding.

Many of the couples who have pledged themselves to each other as domestic partners are lesbians and gay men, who have no other means of legally recognizing their relationships.

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to take this away. Proposition K claims to be designed to end the city’s policy of allowing the domestic partners of city employees to participate (at their own expense) in the city’s health plan. Not true.

The health policy was adopted by the Health Services Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors because both Boards thought it was only fair. But whether you agree with this or not, Proposition K will have no effect on the health plan whatsoever.

Proposition K won’t save taxpayers one cent.

The only thing that Proposition K does is to repeal the law which allows lesbian, gay, and other unmarried couples to register their relationships. The health plan policy wouldn’t be changed at all.

Proposition K is a deceptive and cynical attempt to use arguments about health benefits to get rid of the registration law.

The Domestic Partners law has cost the city nothing. All of its administration has been paid for by the fees paid by the couples who register. The Domestic Partnership law has helped give all San Franciscans the respect they deserve. Keep the Domestic Partnership law and reject this deceptive political initiative. VOTE NO ON K.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

In 1989, the voters rejected DP (domestic partnerships) because it was a clear giveaway of “special privileges” to a “special interest” group. Mayor Agnos and his allies have called them “mean-spirited” because they disagreed. Agnos and his cronies give people who disagree with them “mean” labels. Their tactics are clear.

San Francisco voters have been supportive of legitimate needs of citizens. But they cannot be intimidated anymore by the mean-spirited politics of a vocal few! Fireman and long-time president of the Health Board, Harry Parechan, wrote about effects DP will have.

He wrote:

Never before has an issue been presented to the Board with such far reaching negative ramifications upon our membership and system. All the testimony, documentation and evidence fell on deaf ears. They knew exactly what they were going to do before they entered the room. They cared not for the members who must now pay increased rates to fund domestic partners.

I’ve never seen a better “orchestrated” scenario in my twenty year career on the board. The Mayor’s appointee, Jack Loos was the “conductor”. The “fix” was in; Increases will effect members in ALL categories, INCLUDING RETIREES. Did any of these individuals seem to care? The answer: NO! They received their orders from “CITY HALL”.

Mr. Agnos tell us the full truth; Money is taken away from families and children, the disabled, homeless and seniors to allocate MILLIONS for Special Interest health coverage.

PROPOSITION “K” WILL SAVE MILLIONS! PLEASE VOTE YES ON K

SRG, Gingmon Randolph
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PAYED ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Domestic Partners isn't a Civil Rights issue. We as minority women take offense in that the special interest promoting Domestic Partners are attempting to get special privileges on the basis of an unnatural sexual conduct.

Civil Rights have always applied to people of unchangeable characteristics such as skin color, sex, or severe handicaps. Homosexuals are attempting to get "Elite Status" on a "behavior" that can be modified.

DON'T BE MISLED, VOTE YES ON K.

Brenda Williams
Chiang Ngah Cheong

"No City Benefits" said the Domestic Partners people. Then, quickly and underhandedly, they took City Benefits. This flagrant dishonesty comes as no surprise.

The sages have said, "Break ye down sexual fences, and, ultimately, other moral/ethical fences will fall." Let us not allow our City to officially recognize these relationships that break down sexual fences, lest, thereby, we invite the corruption of moral/ethical values all around. Please repeat the Domestic Partners measure now.

Please vote Yes on K.

Rabbi Leib Feldman

Honesty is part of good society. The direction taken by supporters of domestic partners is dishonest. During the campaign for domestic partners, the proponents argued that this measure was about "recognition" not "benefits". Within one week of passage, their campaign manager said that "benefits" were the goal.

City government granted domestic partners benefits. Their next goal is similar recognition and benefits from firms doing business with the city, then recognition and benefits from private firms in general.

Supporters claim domestic partners costs employers nothing, but insurance providers have indicated that increases in rates for everyone will be part of any domestic partners coverage. Business can't afford these increased costs.

Vote for less government interference with business.

Vote Yes on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian, Business Owner

Board of Supervisors:
"As a retired City employee I most vehemently oppose "domestic partners" being added to present health care coverage. I gave all my energies in 20 years of employment for the City expecting in return to get benefits to cover my retirement years. Now my security is being eroded by increases in program costs, and by an immoral proposition which the Board is bending to under political pressure." Helen Governale

Above is a genuine letter sent to our Supervisors. This letter was among many, all were against benefits! San Franciscans for Responsible Government, (SRG) salutes retired city employees for their years of service. If you're a city employee, active or retired and feel the pinch on your finances, SRG is here to help. Together we will make a difference! Help this campaign, send $15.00 for membership, more if you can. SRG Box 347321, San Francisco, CA 94134

San Franciscans for Responsible Government is a broad based multi-ethnic coalition, composed of individuals from business, religious and community institutions, dedicated to restoring honesty and accountability in City government.

Karen Wong

The Supervisors and Mayor illegally enacted legislation, that provides live-in lovers of municipal employees a share of San Francisco health program, irrespective of their medical condition. Federal and San Francisco health plans explicitly limit coverage to employee's spouse and children (Section 8.428).

San Francisco is a city governed by charter, which can only be altered by a vote of the people. If Mayor Agnos and the Supervisors wish to change the word "spouse" to read Domestic Partners (DP), then by law, it must be submitted to a vote. Therefore, an employee's live-in lover is not eligible to participate in the health service system.

The Mayor has said he will continue offering health benefits to live-in lovers even if DP is repealed, thereby, compounding the illegality. However, without DP it will be impossible to identify eligible candidates. Our politicians have positioned themselves above the law. This action, if allowed will set a precedent for future violations. Therefore, send a strong message to City Hall.

Reject this violation of our rights! Vote YES on K.

Marcel Weiland
San Franciscans for Responsible Government
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Let's send a strong message to those who have betrayed the trust of The People. The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have arrogantly granted “domestic partners” (DP) benefits that will cost our city millions! Now the burden is being placed on the backs of retired city workers! How shameful! After years of dedicated service, is this how we want to repay our civil servants?

This law if left standing will in a short time explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our city! It is so loosely written that attorneys are calling it “a new field in law.”

DID YOU KNOW THAT DPs DON'T EVEN NEED TO LIVE IN SF TO GET BENEFITS!

Fed up! San Franciscans for Responsible Government represents you. Together we will make a difference! Please send what you can to help this campaign. Become a member: Send $15.00, more if you can, SRO Box 347321 San Francisco, CA 94134

Marcel Weiland

Robert Achtenberg lost a case defining dependents of employee’s families. In Hinman v Personnel Administration, a homosexual tried to establish his partner as his spouse to qualify him for benefits. The court held the state’s policy promoting marriage advances by confirming statutory rights on married partners. Without legislation no basis exists for extending rights to nonmarital relations. Only a man and woman can marry. (Civ. Code 4100). Are our “leaders” treating domestic partners as married? This isn’t legal. San Francisco health plans limit coverage to employee’s spouses and dependents. The voters reaffirmed this seven times. An employee’s friend is not eligible to participate in the health service system. Yes on K will repeal the basis for the Mayor’s illegal acts.

The charter provides “It shall be the duty to apply benefits without special favor or privilege.” Granting health benefits to domestic partners is a special favor and privilege. Harry Paretschau, President of Health Board, claims a fix was in before the April 1991 meeting of the Health Board.

The Board met to reduce health premiums. Now increases will take effect. Is this equitable? Does it make sense to allow domestic partners benefits and to deny it to mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers? Not unless you are beholden to the gay political machine. Send a message to the fools in silly hall. Just say no to special interests. Say no to domestic partners. Yes on K.

Russell Davis

Promoters of domestic partners now talk of forcing private businesses to pay for benefits! How will this affect our business community? Will businesses be driven out of San Francisco to avoid more government regulations and an increasingly hostile business environment? Could this affect our tax base? Our jobs?

They promised us domestic partners would cost nothing! Can we afford to find out how much it’ll really cost?

VOTE YES ON “K”!

Tim Robinson

Vote Yes on K. Stop extending city administered health insurance fringe benefits to any friend, an active or retired municipal employee, 46,000, chooses to designate a domestic partner and that person’s dependents.

Vote K yes. Repeal the domestic partners law. Health insurance is a voter mandated fringe benefit still restricted by Charter laws to employees and dependents. Neither the Mayor, supervisors nor ordinance of any kind may modify Charter laws. Our Supervisors without legal authority, contrary to laws enacted legislation including domestic partners in this health insurance program. State and federal laws prohibits persons of the same sex from marrying. Consequently, employees’ friends, unless legal spouses, or dependents may not be granted these benefits.

Vote K — Yes, granting a city fringe to friends of employees is powerful evidence that our civic leaders think they can ignore voter laws. Vote Yes. Show them they’re wrong.

Vote yes — Unless domestic partner law is repealed, health insurance cost, for everyone, not only municipal workers will skyrocket beyond affordability of many people.

Vote yes — If the Mayor and Supervisors are allowed to get away with this mockery they will soon be dipping into the multi-million dollar fund for retired employees’ pension.

Vote yes — All of our elected representatives as well as the mayoral candidates are aware that extending a city fringe to persons other than municipal employees is illegal. But don’t expect any of them to have the courage to oppose or even criticize this illegal legislation.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

“In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law.”
- United States Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, 1896

95 years later, some people still don’t get it.

NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Labor unions representing 79,000 San Francisco workers have supported our city's domestic partnership program. Join us in voting NO ON K, to stop the repeal of domestic partnership rights.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

San Francisco Tomorrow is an environmental group working to improve the quality of life in the City. The Domestic Partners law does just that for many. Vote to keep it. Vote NO on K!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Please stand with me and reject this attack on lesbians and gay men. Voters of San Francisco adopted the domestic partners ordinance last year. No sooner did voters act when a misguided group launched a repeal drive.

This repeal saves taxpayers nothing. It does not take back health benefits. It just strips away the rights of domestic partners to register their relationships.

Help affirm the rights of every person to justice, respect, and freedom from discrimination. I urge you to reject bigotry, and put an end to this annual ballot bashing against our own people.

Stop the repeal of domestic partners.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

Simple Fairness.
Gay and lesbian families deserve the same standing, benefits, and respect as all families.

Michael S. Bernick, BART Director
James Fang, BART Director

The Domestic Partners law passed by the voters acknowledges the existence of loving, committed relationships, providing certain basic rights to registered domestic partners. To oppose recognizing lesbian and gay domestic partnerships is anti-gay bigotry.

Gloria Estela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to deny recognition of an important element of the diverse family life that has been the hallmark of San Francisco. As Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Family Policy, I studied San Francisco's families. As a candidate for elected office, I campaigned for domestic partnerships. As Supervisor, I have voted to support domestic partnerships as well as other families that contribute so much to San Francisco.

The repeal of the domestic partnership registration system takes away the ability of couples, both gay and straight, to pledge their legally binding commitment to one another and the City’s ability to recognize that commitment. Repealing domestic partnerships serves no valid public purpose.

I urge you to vote no on Proposition K.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Last year the Board of Supervisors passed and the voters upheld the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

The proponents committed that there would be no cost to the taxpayers as a result. This commitment has been honored.

Now there is an attempt to prevent the Health Service Board from allowing domestic partners to provide health insurance for their partners at no expense to the public. All City employees are already required to pay the health costs of any spouse, partner or dependent.

It is foolish and mean-spirited to try to prevent City workers from providing health care insurance for their loved ones at their own expense.

Please join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher
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Last year, we fought FOR Proposition K. This time we are fighting AGAINST Proposition K. But the principle remains the same: Domestic Partnership is a fair and just way to recognize lesbian, gay and other non-traditional families.
Join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Your mother told you not to hate anybody.
Listen to your mother.
NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Domestic Partnership is about Justice. The measure passed by the voters last year requires no city tax dollars; it is completely self-supporting. Support of Domestic Partnership and opposition to Proposition K represents the consensus position of the elected leadership of San Francisco.

The Domestic Partners ordinance provides a legal registry to foster respect for lesbian, gay and other unmarried couples. This is one way San Francisco can address the discrimination and neglect they face.
We urge you to vote "NO" on Proposition K, so that our city can continue to officially encourage loving and caring families.

Nancy Pelosi, United States Congress
Milton Marks, California Senate
Willie Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly
John Burton, California Assembly

Ignatius Bau
Barbara Cameron
Henry Der
Tessie Guillermo
Ericka Huggins
Don Masuda
Enola Maxwell
Jose Medina
Barbara Neighbors-Glass
Ruth Picon
Karen Pierce
Leonilla Ramirez
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Doris Thomas
Leland Yee
Vu-Duc Vuong
Lawrence Wong
Alan Wong

There's one issue on which all of the major candidates for Mayor agree. We're all voting NO on Proposition K.
Proposition K is a deceptive and misguided attempt to repeal the domestic partners law that San Francisco voters passed last year.
The domestic partners law has worked well, providing legal recognition of the diversity of family life in our city — at no cost to taxpayers.
Proposition K perpetuates divisiveness and bigotry when we should be striving for mutual respect.
Join us in voting NO on Proposition K.

Art Agnos
Angela Alioto
Richard Hongisto
Tom Hsieh
Frank Jordan
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Domestic Partnership is an issue of CHOICE! The lesbian and gay community, with the approval of San Francisco voters, has created a process for the city to recognize their relationships through a registration system, since they are not legally eligible for marriage. A small section of religious fundamentalists are trying to overturn this legislation. They want to impose their lifestyles on the entire population — preventing women from exercising their right to choose relating to pregnancy — preventing lesbian and gay couples from exercising their right to the choice of loving relationships of their own sex.

If we cannot demonstrate the importance of maintaining our freedom of choice here in San Francisco, it will surely be endangered throughout the country. Vote No on Proposition K.

Regina Gabrielle, Executive Director, Womens' Building
Helen Greico, S.F. National Organization for Women PAC
Roma Guy, Founder Womens' Building
Leni Marin, Chair, S.F. Commission on the Status of Women

Almost everyone has lost a friend, relative, co-worker or lover to AIDS. Our city has witnessed a crisis beyond all scope but we have seen an enormous amount of caring and love that has poured out in response to the AIDS epidemic.

The lesbian/gay community, through its response to AIDS and in a hundred other ways, has shown it has the power to love and care. A “No” vote on Proposition K will continue domestic partnership and continue to recognize the love and commitment shared by lesbian and gay couples, and will bring all our communities together as part of the family of San Francisco.

Valentine Aguirre, Latino Coalition on AIDS/SIDA
Angela Davis, Bayview Hunter's Point Foundation
Anne Guillory-Thom, American Indian AIDS Institute
Pat Norman, California AIDS Intervention
Eric Rofes, Shanti Project
Lee Woo, Black and White Men Together

The San Francisco Democratic Party Supports Domestic Partnerships. By an overwhelming majority, the Central Committee has voted to maintain Domestic Partnerships and to oppose Proposition K.

The Democratic Party has a strong tradition of support for civil rights and individual freedoms.

In San Francisco, let us define what we consider a family.

Join your local Democratic Party in recognizing the diversity of families in our city.

We urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION K.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic Party
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O'Conner, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

(organizations for identification purposes only)
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

"Equal" rights has to apply to everyone. Or it really isn't "equal" at all.

Whatever improvements might be needed in the existing "domestic partners" legislation, its basic goal is to stop discrimination against minorities.

That's in the interest of all minorities — and we add up to a majority.

Proposition K would bring back discrimination against one minority. If it passes, which minority will be next?

Grassroots

All San Franciscans deserve fairness, justice, and the support of family.

Domestic partners registration costs the city nothing.

We admire the caring that strengthens our entire San Francisco family.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K.

Veronica Abrickis, Catholic
Reverend Steven Allen, Zen
Jorge Arango, Catholic
Reverend Louis Ashley, Glide Memorial
Reverend Mary Arwood, Episcopal
Danny Baruita, Catholic
Dorothy Beattie, Integrity
Rabbi Allen Bennett, American Jewish Congress
Reverend Susan Bergmans, Episcopal
Reverend Walter Bock, Lutheran
Reverend Jerene Broadway, Southern Baptist
Kevin Calegari, Catholic
Reverend Robert Cromey, Episcopal
Reverend James DeLange, Lutheran
Reverend Paul Dirdak, Methodist
Reverend Judith Favor, United Church of Christ
Brother Derek Ford, Jail Chaplaincy
Reverend Ruth Frost, Lutheran
Marilyn Geist, Integrity
Reverend Lee Gerdes, Lutheran
Darlene Giusti, Catholic
Reverend Peter Hayn, Episcopal
Reverend Michael Hertz, Presbyterian
Reverend Glenda Hope, Presbyterian
Reverend Neil Housewright, Disciples of Christ
Father James Jelinsek, Episcopal
Reverend Jeff Johnson, Lutheran
Rabbi Yoel Kahn, Sha'ar Zahav
Reverend Chuck Lewis, Night Ministry
Reverend James Lowder, Southern Baptist
Reverend Jane Medema, Southern Baptist
Reverend Canon Michael Merriman, Grace Cathedral
Rabbi David Meyer
Frederick Millen, James Markunas Society
Reverend James Mitsui, Metropolitan Community Church
Bob Nelson, Lutherans Concerned
William Rates, Episcopal
James Rix, Evangelicals Concerned
Reverend Penny Sarvis, United Church of Christ
Reverend Jane Spahr, Presbyterian
Reverend Buddy Trulock, Metropolitan Community Church
Father Tom West, o.f.m., Catholic
Reverend Mickey Williamson, United Church of Christ
Rabbi Peretz Wolf-Prusan, Emanu-El
Reverend Phyllis Zillhart, Lutheran

"Populations of whiptail lizards in the southwestern U.S., Mexico and South America consist of females only."

"The animals are unusual among vertebrates in reproducing by parthenogenesis: virgin birth."

— Scientific American 1/84

Religious extremists oppose Domestic Partners because their interpretation of Scripture tells them homosexuality is "unnatural". Those scriptures can't explain why scientists have found so much homosexuality in nature — including five species of lesbian lizards. These "whiptails" reproduce without males.

Yet a solitary female can't reproduce — she has to go through a sexual "mating dance" with another female before she can ovulate!

"Scriptures" were what we had before books were invented.

Taboos on "adultery" and "sodomy" served to reduce sexually transmitted diseases; other ways were unknown.

Times change. Rigid sexual taboos are obsolete.

Condoms protect much more reliably than sermons.

Don't bring back an antiquated discrimination. Vote NO.

Grassroots
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Be it ordained by The People of the City and County of San Francisco: The People amend The San Francisco Administrative Code by Repealing Chapter 62.1 through 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance Sect. 1. HISTORY

(a) The Domestic Partners Ordinance was initially proposed in San Francisco during the Feinstein Administration. It was approved by the Board of Supervisors but vetoed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. In 1989 The Domestic Partners Ordinance was again approved by The Board of Supervisors and was signed into law by Mayor Art Agnos. The Domestic Partners Ordinance was then rejected by the People in a referendum vote known as Proposition "S".

(b) In 1990 The Board of Supervisors again approved and proposed a modified version of the Domestic Partners Ordinance known as proposition "K". Having removed the costly health benefits provision, the Board of Supervisors promoted the Domestic Partners Ordinance as a symbolic initiative to give homosexual relationships formal recognition. The People of San Francisco were convinced by the public debate, the official ballot arguments, by The Board of Supervisors, and special interest groups, that proposition "K"; the Domestic Partners Ordinance would put a financial burden on the City or citizens. The proponents promised that the Domestic Partners Ordinance would be fully funded by its registrants.

(c) In June of 1991, The Board of Supervisors voted to offer a costly health benefits package to unmarried couples registered as Domestic Partners, and employed by the City. Mayor Art Agnos has indicated that he will sign the bill into law.

(d) The Supervisors who approved and submitted proposition "K" before The People are: Alioto, Brit, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Nelder, Walker, and Ward.

Sec. 2. FINDINGS

(a) Whereas, The People of San Francisco have been misled by their elected Supervisors, and the special interest groups supporting the Domestic Partners ordinance, into believing that no moneyny benefits would be granted to domestic partnerships.

(b) Whereas, The Board of Supervisors, after removing the controversial health benefits package, and promised to The People, that this measure was cost free, have now circumvented their promise and The People of San Francisco by approving health benefits.

(c) Whereas, Insurance companies covering City employees have asked for an estimated $2,000,000.00 (two million) or more, to expand coverage to domestic partners for the first year!

(d) Whereas, due to the likelihood of a large percentage of A.I.D.S./H.I.V. related claims, the estimated $2,000,000.00 (two million) for the first year will most likely be much higher in subsequent years.

(e) Whereas, health premiums to city employees, and retired City workers with fixed incomes will be increased to cover the health benefits granted to these unmarried domestic partners.

(f) Whereas, The Domestic Partners Ordinance threatens to directly cost the City millions of dollars in court costs due to the vagueness of the text. The Domestic Partners Ordinance allows one partner to sue the other for "failure to give notice". It is also unclear as to what will happen to the property, or the children of these domestic partners once they break up. The Domestic Partners Ordinance is a litigation time bomb that threatens to explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our City.

Sec. 3. By the will of The People of San Francisco

(a) The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by repealing in its entirety Chapters 62.1 to 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance.

The following is the text of the ordinance which would be repealed by Proposition K.

RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

Sec. 62.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this ordinance is to create a way to recognize intimate committed relationships, including those of lesbians and gay men who otherwise are denied the right to identify the partners with whom they share their lives. All costs of registration must be covered by fees to be established by ordinance.

Sec. 62.2. DEFINITIONS

(a) Domestic Partnership. Domestic Partners are two adults who have chosen to share one another's lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring, who live together, and who have agreed to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses incurred during the Domestic Partnership. They must sign a Declaration of Domestic Partnership, and establish the partnership under section 3 of this chapter.

(b) "Live Together." "Live together" means that two people share the same living quarters. It is not necessary that the legal right to possess the quarters be in both of their names. Two people may live together even if one or both have additional living quarters. Domestic Partners do not cease to live together if one leaves the shared quarters but intends to return.

(c) "Basic Living Expenses." "Basic living expenses" means the cost of basic food and shelter. It also includes the expenses which are paid at least in part by a program or benefit for which the partner qualified because of the domestic partnership. The individuals need not contribute equally or jointly to the cost of these expenses as long as they agree that both are responsible for the costs.

(d) "Declaration of Domestic Partnership." A "Declaration of Domestic Partnership" is a form provided by the County Clerk. By signing it, two people agree to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses which they incur during the domestic partnership and that this agreement can be enforced by anyone to whom those expenses are owed. They also state under penalty of perjury that they met the definition of domestic partnership when they signed the statement, that neither is married, that they are not related to each other in a way which would bar marriage in California, and that neither had a different domestic partner less than six months before they signed. This last condition does not apply if the previous domestic partner died. The form will also require each partner to provide a mailing address. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.3. ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a) Methods. Two persons may establish a Domestic Partnership by either:

1. Presenting a signed Declaration of Domestic Partnership to the County Clerk, who will file it and give the partners a certificate showing that the Declaration was filed; or

2. Having a Declaration of Domestic Partnership notarized and giving a copy to the person who witnessed the signing (who may or may not be the notary).

(b) Time Limitation. A person cannot become a member of a Domestic Partnership until at least six months after any other Domestic Partnership of which he or she was a member ended. This does not apply if the earlier domestic partnership ended because one of the members died.

(c) Residence Limitation. The County Clerk will only file Declaration of Domestic Partnership if:

1. The partners have a residence in San Francisco; or

2. At least one of the partners works in San Francisco. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.4 ENDING DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

(a) When the Partnership Ends. A Domestic Partnership ends when:

1. One partner sends the other a written notice that he or she has ended the partnership; or

2. One of the partners dies; or

3. One of the partners marries or the partners no longer live together.

(b) Notice the Partnership Has Ended.

(1) To Domestic Partners. When a Domestic Partnership ends, at least one of the partners must sign a notice saying that the partnership has ended. The notice must be dated and signed under penalty of perjury. If the Declaration of Domestic Partnership was filed with the County Clerk, the notice must be filed with the clerk; otherwise, the notice must be notarized. The partner who signs the notice must send a copy to the other partner.

(2) To Third Parties. When a Domestic Partnership ends, a Domestic Partner who has given a copy of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership to any third party, (or, if that partner has died, the surviving member of the domestic partnership) must give that third party a notice signed under penalty of perjury stating the partnership has ended. The notice must be sent within 60 days of the end of the Domestic Partnership.

(3) Failure to Give Notice. Failure to give either of the notices required by this subsection (Continued on next page)
will neither prevent nor delay termination of the Domestic Partnership. Anyone who suffers any loss as a result of failure to send either of these notices may sue for actual losses.
Sec. 62.5. COUNTY CLERK’S RECORDS
(a). Amendments to Declarations. A Partner may amend a Declaration of Domestic Partnership filed with the County Clerk at any time to show a change in his or her mailing address.
(b). New Declarations of Domestic Partnership. No person who has filed a declaration of Domestic Partnership with the County Clerk may file another declaration of Domestic Partnership until six months after a notice the partnership has ended has been filed. However, if the Domestic Partnership ended because one of the partners died, a new Declaration may be filed anytime after the notice the partnership ended is filed.
(c). Maintenance of County Clerk’s Records. The County Clerk will keep a record of all Declarations of Domestic Partnership, amendments to Declarations of Domestic Partnership and all notices that a partnership has ended. The records will be maintained so that amendments and notices a partnership has ended are filed with the Declaration of Domestic Partnership to which they apply.
(d). Filing Fees. The Board of Supervisors will set the filing fee for Declarations of Domestic Partnership and Amendments. No fee will be charged for notices that a partnership has ended. The fees charged must cover the city’s cost of administering this ordinance. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)
Sec. 62.6. LEGAL EFFECT OF DECLARATION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP
(a). Obligations. The obligations of domestic partners to each other are those described by the definition.
(b). Duration of Rights and Duties. If a domestic partnership ends, the partners incur no further obligations to each other. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)
Sec. 62.7. CODIFICATION. Upon adoption, the Clerk of the Board shall codify this amendment into the San Francisco Administrative Code. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)
Sec. 62.8. FILING FEES. For each filing of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership and each Amendment to a Declaration of Domestic Partnership the County Clerk shall charge a fee of $35. (Added by Ord. 2-91, App. 1/14/91)
HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333

MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote. Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.
PROPOSITION L

Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City owns about 30 acres of property on Phelan Avenue across from City College. The Balboa Reservoirs cover about 28 acres of this property. The “Phelan Loop,” at the corner of Phelan and Ocean, occupies about another 2 acres. There is a bookstore and a turn-around for Muni buses on the Phelan Loop.

The City is negotiating to have built on the Phelan Loop: 120 units of affordable housing for seniors, about 9300 square feet of commercial space, 3250 square feet of office space, a Muni drivers’ rest stop, and parking for 57 cars.

The Phelan Loop is currently zoned “P” (Public Use District). This means that it can be used only for public purposes. The Phelan Loop must be rezoned before the proposed development could be allowed. The Planning Commission has approved the proposed development but only if the Phelan Loop is rezoned.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed an ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). Before that ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would approve the ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). The proposed development would be permitted if the Phelan Loop is rezoned “NC-2.”

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from “P” to “NC-2” to go into effect.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from “P” to “NC-2” to be rejected.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How “L” Got on the Ballot
On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition L to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 12, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 23,420 of the signatures submitted were valid, 4,622 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Phelan Avenue Use

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

A YES VOTE ON Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing, a new MUNI driver restroom and some 9,300 square feet of neighborhood serving retail space will be built in a location that presently houses only a MUNI stop along Ocean Avenue. This two acre parcel is not now nor has it ever been a part of City College and it's development as affordable senior rental housing will in no way impair the ability of City College to expand into the "Balboa Reservoir" to the north.

San Francisco's senior population, which numbers more than any other Bay Area County, both as a percentage of the total population and in absolute numbers, critically needs this housing. Ocean View critically needs this infusion of neighborhood serving retail space. The rezoning is consistent with the neighborhood commercial use of this portion of Ocean Avenue and it's 40 foot height limitation is actually some 20 feet below the maximum allowable height. The rezoning and development of this senior affordable rental housing is a win-win situation for our City's seniors, the local neighborhood and City College. In fact, right now over 2,000 seniors attend City College, and many of them could qualify for the proposed housing. Vote Yes for senior housing, vote Yes for neighborhood serving businesses, vote Yes for improved MUNI driver facilities; Vote Yes for Proposition L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh
Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I disagree with Art Agnos when he says this land is not needed by City College. That has been his claim through three elections, and he is still wrong.

Housing can go elsewhere. City College can't.

Education, of primary importance to the children of our city, is in deep trouble. Lack of education is a root cause of unemployment, resulting poverty, homelessness, crime and drug abuse.

As the world becomes technologically advanced, it becomes imperative we expand and improve our educational system. For children of lower and middle income families, City College provides their last if not their only opportunity for an affordable college education.

To support our future and the future of our children, we must support City College. Who owned this land in the past is not an issue.

The issue is whether we are going to support City College.

Richard Hongisto

I concur. Remember when AGNOS TRIED TO SELL 11.6 ACRES of the campus to a developer for $36,900? This is part of the same piece of land.

I was active in liberal politics long before Art Agnos arrived, carpetbag in hand. I say HONGISTO HAS THE BEST CHANCE OF RESCUING OUR CITY

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
John Riordan, City College Board Emeritus

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

WHAT? AGAIN?
Incredibly, this is the FOURTH TIME this issue has been on the ballot.

This is part of the Balboa Reservoir that was once part of the CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS. Repeatedly the voters of San Francisco have refused to rezone part of the old West Campus. Repeatedly they have voted to give it back to the college.

Since then, the college has made plans for the land. But here they are back again with a last ditch effort to divert part of the land into private hands.

The land is the same, the issues are the same, even the letter of the proposition is the same. The voters said “L NO!” three years ago, and should say the same again.

This is about EDUCATION.
This is about COMMUNITY COLLEGE LAND.
This is about access to affordable education for CHILDREN OF LOWER INCOME AND WORKING CLASS FAMILIES.

City College serves all incomes, but for many it is the college of last resort. It has become the BIGGEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN THE WORLD cramped into the smallest campus in the state.

This land is crucial to the planned and much needed development of the “West Campus.” It is presently occupied by the California bookstore, a needed college serving facility, and the City College Station, the key transportation hub of the campus.

Liberals, conservatives, and moderates support City College and the surrounding neighborhood on this issue. See separate arguments by Candidate for Mayor RICHARD HONGISTO and State Senator QUENTIN KOPP. Also urging you to vote NO is Candidate for Mayor TOM HSIEH. On this issue they all agree.

On November 6, vote “L NO!” and SAVE CITY COLLEGE LAND — AGAIN.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Dave Wall, City College Physics Professor
Lou Baimale, City College Chancellor Emeritus

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The opponents argument against Proposition L is simplyfactually wrong. Proposition L will not harm City College and they know it.

FACT: In the months of public testimony over this rezoning before the Public Utilities Commission, the Planning Commission and the Board, no current official of City College testified against the rezoning nor raised any objection about the senior housing proposed for the site. No such official City College opposition exists.

FACT: The Phelan Loop has never been a part of a “West Campus” of City College. It has been owned by the PUC and used for a fire station and MUNI stop. Both uses will continue if L passes. The privately owned book store can also be accommodated in the 9,000 square feet of retail space in the senior housing development.

FACT: The 28 acres of Balboa Reservoir that City College has requested is in the process of being transferred to them by the PUC.

FACT: Both the old and the new City College Master Plan do not include the Phelan Loop site as it is not needed for the college’s future expansion.

The simple truth is that the opponents of L are try to hold hostage critically needed senior housing to further some obscure private agenda. It’s time to quit playing private politics with public land.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Francisco has the highest percentage of seniors of any city in California with a population of over 100,000. Over half of these seniors are paying more than 50% of their income on housing. Senior homeowners cannot afford to make needed repairs on their homes and pay for other necessities. Senior renters are living in sub-standard conditions, unable to pay for adequate health care or food after rent.

A Yes Vote on L would allow for the construction of 120 units of affordable senior housing by a community based, non-profit housing development corporation. These units would give seniors living on fixed incomes the opportunity to live productive lives in a caring and supportive community — in units that are safe and affordable.

Show you care about the lives of San Francisco senior citizens. Vote Yes on L.

Erma Brin, SF Grey Panthers
George Twigg-Porter, Apostleship of Prayer
Clarissa Ward, SF Legislative Forum for Older Americans
Edward L. Peet, CA Legislative Council for Older Americans
Bruce McSpadden, SF United Methodist Mission
Geraldine Earp, Senior Action Network
Philip Klasky, Yerba Buena Consortium
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Robert Pender, Park Merced Residents Association
Rochelle Frazier, SF Business and Professional Women
William Price, Jr., Congress of California Seniors, RegII
Joe Lacey, Pres., TURN
Wendy Brown, San Francisco AIA
Sandi Peters, Catholic Committee on Aging
Kathleen Lammers, California Law Center on Long Term Care
Meg Doherty, SF Long Term Care Ombudsman Program
Frank Salet, California Senior Legislature
Howard Levy, Legal Assistance to the Elderly
Jane Holt, Central YMCA Senior Program
Annie Chung, Self Help for the Elderly
Leo McCarthy, Lt. Governor
Milton Marks, State Senator
John Burton, State Assembly

As neighbors of the proposed senior housing on the Phelan Loop site, we urge you to vote YES on L.

The Phelan Loop site has been an eyesore in our neighborhood for too long! Everyone wins with the proposal for this site. Seniors get housing they can afford; MUNI drivers get new break and restrooms they need; City College gets a new pedestrian arcade and space for future expansion is preserved. The community will see an eyesore replaced with a well designed building anchoring the eastern end of the Ocean Avenue commercial strip serving as a gateway to our neighborhood.

Vote YES on L and support both our seniors and our neighborhood.

Ocean View-Merced Ingleside
Community Association
Merchants Association of OMI
Joseph G. Kennedy Democratic Club
Ingleside Community Center
OMI Senior Center
Southwest Neighborhood Improvement Group
Ingleside Presbyterian Church
Minnie Ward
Geraldine Clay
Rev. Roland Gordon
L. Andrew Jeanpierre
Edward and Christina McGovern
Claude and Zenobia Everhard
Bill Taylor
Linda Johnson
Bettye Simon
Lencel and Marcelle Henderson
Bob Landis

San Francisco needs permanently affordable senior rental housing. The proposed rezoning will allow the development of 120 such units along Ocean Avenue. It is supported by neighborhood merchants, community groups and senior organizations across the City. As environmentalists, we strongly urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Ed Emerson, San Francisco Tomorrow
Peter Moylan, SFT
Bernie Choden, SFT
*For ID purposes only

Mayor Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

A Yes vote on Proposition L is a YES for seniors, a YES for MUNI, a YES for City College, a YES for area merchants and a YES for the community. Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing will be built on a vacant eyesore known as Phelan Loop. It will also ensure that a new MUNI driver’s rest stop and a new bus stop will be constructed in the loop. It will provide for a pedestrian arcade for students walking to City College. It will also provide 9,300 s/f of neighborhood serving retail space, and will serve as a gateway to the Ocean Avenue commercial corridor and the community.

The building is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood with its 40 foot height limit. The proposed zoning — NC-2 — is the prevailing zoning on Ocean Avenue, and would complete the Ocean Avenue residential/commercial corridor to the east.

With over 50% of our City’s seniors paying over 50% of their income on housing, this housing is critically needed. Our seniors deserve to live in a safe, secure and friendly environment, in a home they can afford.

Vote YES for senior housing. Vote YES for MUNI, vote YES for City College, vote YES for neighborhood merchants, vote YES for the community. Vote YES on L.

Rev. John Lane, Co-Chair
Jim Feliciano, Co-Chair
Sue C. Hestor, Tres., Phelan Loop Senior Housing Coalition

As church and community based non-profit affordable housing producers we strongly urge a Yes vote on Proposition L. Affordable senior housing is critically needed by our City’s 140,000 seniors, over 60% of whom are officially classified as either very low or low income residents. Rezoning this two acre parcel on Ocean Avenue will mean that 120 seniors will have an affordable and decent place to live.

Rene Cazenave, Council of Community Housing Organizations
Maryann Dillon, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Geraldine Johnson, SF Housing Development Corp.
Calvin Welch, Haight-Ashbury Community Development Corp.
Chuck Turner, Community Design Center
Gordon Chin, Chinese Community Housing Corporation
David Brigode, Community Housing Partnership
Randy Shaw, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Francis McKinney, San Francisco Housing Development Corp.
Marylou Goeke, Catholic Charities
Kelly Cullen, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

CITY COLLEGE DOESN’T NEED THE MUNI STATION AND WE DON’T NEED CITY COLLEGE

In the old days, people used to struggle to go to college, struggle to find a job, and struggle to find housing. City College was set up in the old days when San Franciscans thought people should struggle.

Now days, we have television so people don’t need to read and struggle for education. They don’t need to struggle to find a job or housing. Leaders like Art Agnos are showing the way so that people don’t have to struggle.

There is a lot of space at City College that could be better used for housing than for flowers, grass, and playing fields. These days, we have more relevant things to do with public land.

I not only urge you to vote YES, I urge the City to rezone most of the rest of the campus for affordable housing.

Lewis Epstein, Humanitarian
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Phelan Avenue Use

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

SAME OLD THING
This is the same old public land give-away you turned down three years ago and the year before that.

IGNORE CLAIMS OF "AFFORDABLE" HOUSING. As a realtor and retired Supervisor, I advise you it’s all HOGWASH.
The way it’s set up, most of the HOGS that would benefit would have MORE THAN AVERAGE INCOME.
Don’t let greedy developers take a big chunk of valuable City College campus.

John Barbabelata

Voters have TWICE AGREED WITH US that the acreage in question can best be used to RELIEVE THE OVERCROWDED CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS.
Nothing has changed.
Join us again by voting NO on L.

Lou Batmale, Chancellor Emeritus, City College

SAFETY
TWO STUDENTS A YEAR ARE KILLED on Ocean Avenue since streetcars stopped pulling into the CITY COLLEGE STATION.
Building apartments PREVENTS SOLUTIONS.
SAVE STUDENTS LIVES. Vote NO on L.

Dave Wall

EDUCATION is the biggest and most important investment we can make in our future. We should be adding space, classrooms and library shelves to CCSF.
STOP TAKING LAND FROM OUR COLLEGE.

Roger Olson

THE CAMPUS KEY
Agnos, after three elections to sell 12.6 ACRES of public land to a private developer for $36,900, still wants the key Ocean Avenue frontage, the transportation hub of the campus, for his developer friends.
L No!

Dave Wall

Progressive San Franciscans will not allow so-called “affordable” housing to be played off against legitimately affordable education.
The costs of a college education are skyrocketing. Many more San Francisco students will be attending City College in the future, because it is excellent and affordable. But there are 28,000 students at crowded City College now, will there be facilities for them in the future?
NOT IF THE WEST CAMPUS IS SOLD A DEVELOPER.
LABOR SAYS NO on L.
The future education of thousands of San Franciscans is at stake!

American Federation of Teachers — Local 2121
Committee on Political Education.
Mike Hulbert, President

OVERWHELMING NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION
Precincts next to the college have voted up to 95% against rezoning this land in THREE previous elections.
L NO! to rezoning.
HELP THE NEIGHBORHOOD HELP THE COLLEGE.

Ellen Wall, Sunnyside
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The fact that this issue even has to be on the ballot is an insult to the voters of San Francisco.

The public has determined three times not to rezone this piece of public property to allow developers to build housing in an already congested area, deciding instead to return the area to City College of San Francisco (the world’s most populated community college), because it needs space.

Vote “NO” on Proposition L

In 1986, 1987 and 1988 the voters determined that City College’s use of the property outweighed the benefits of developing the land. Anyone who visits the area during the day knows the importance of the reservoir area to CCSF. CCSF provides San Franciscans of all socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds the opportunity to receive a college education. This unique educational policy has provided hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans the chance to succeed in today’s competitive world. Its growing population has, however, been greeted with a shrinking campus.

The latest intrusion would create a huge private apartment building, approximately the size of the City College Science Building, directly across the street from the tiny campus. The building would provide 29 parking spaces for 120 units. Planners assert that 20,000 students a day would be funneled through a narrow tunnel in this private structure, downwind of diesel bus fumes, on their way to class. It doesn’t take a Rhodes Scholar to realize City College needs the area for our children and grandchildren who strive mightily for education in a painful environment. Vote “NO” on Proposition L.

San Francisco Taxpayers’ Association
Vice-President Quentin L. Kopp

A federal audit discovered that 52 cents out of every taxpayer dollar HDC, the Phelan Loop developer got went for ‘administration’, not housing.

You pay for the proposed housing the developer will profit from, but You don’t get preference.

Vote NO on Prop L—“Poverty Profiteering”

Peter Paul
Veritas Journal & Reform Government

TAKING CITY COLLEGE WITHOUT THE SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE IS NOT DEMOCRATIC. DON’T LET AGNOS AND HIS POLITICAL CRONIES GET AWAY WITH THIS ILL CONCEIVED LAND GRAB. NO-L-NO

Rich Bodisco
Chairman, S.F. Reasonable Reform
Rick Fenton
A Concerned Citizen

Beware of sly landlords and vindictive politicians who drive up rents and tax middle class voters to house the poor and elderly.

A crowded, noisy campus is inappropriate for this distinguished project. The City should prepare a comprehensive plan allowing for classroom and library expansion and more appropriate student-oriented housing.

The most affordable housing is existing affordable housing. Vacancy rent control must be preserved; evictions and unconscionable rent hikes stopped!

Don’t be fooled by deceptive, big-money campaigns!

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS FOR NO ON L AND YES ON M

Brian Doohan — SOMA
Barbara Meskunas — Western Addition
Joel Venetresca — Haight
Margaret Verges — Presidio
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ADOPING CHANGES IN PROPERTY USE CLASSIFICATION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 11 PHELAN AVENUE, NORTHWEST CORNER AT OCEAN AVENUE, A PORTION OF LOT 1, ASSESSOR’S BLOCK 3180 FROM A P (PUBLIC USE) DISTRICT TO AN NC-2 (SMALL SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) DISTRICT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 101.1 OF THE PLANNING CODE.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to resolution of the Board of Supervisors, adopting the final negative declaration as its own, and pursuant to Section 302(e) of the City Planning Code, Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the following change in property use classification, duly approved by resolution of the City Planning Commission is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco.

Use District
Superseded
Hereby

Description of Property

Beginning at the north end of the curve with a radius of 39.60 feet between the westerly line of Phelan Avenue and northerly line of Ocean Avenue as shown on Parcel 2 on Parcel Map of the Widening of Phelan and Ocean Avenues, filed February 15, 1954, in Map Book “R”, page 56, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco; thence on said curve to the right, tangent to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue, with a radius of 39.60 feet through a central angle of 104°52'08", an arc length of 72.48 feet to the northerly line of Ocean Avenue, as widened; thence along said northerly line tangent to the preceding curve 16.41 feet; thence deflecting to the right 76°36'57" 137.64 feet; thence deflecting to the left 92°32'29" 138.01 feet; thence deflecting to the left 88°56'25" 99.35 feet to a point on the northerly line of Ocean Avenue; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 104°52'08" 265.40 feet; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 0°26'4" 48.44 to the southeast corner of the parcel described in Deed from City and County of San Francisco to Safeway Stores Inc., a corporation, recorded June 2, 1954, in Book 6386, Page 412, Official Records; thence deflecting 90° to the right along the easterly line of said Safeway Stores parcel and its prolongation 171.18 feet; thence deflecting to the right 74°18'59" 378.28 feet; thence deflecting to the left 9°28'25" 81.04 feet to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue; thence deflecting to the right 99°51'14" along said westerly line 264.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; being a portion of Lot 1 in Assessor’s Block 3180; and adjacent street areas to their centerline as designated on Sectional Map No. 12 of the Zoning Map.

Section 2. Pursuant to Section 101.1 of the Code, this Board of Supervisors adopts City Planning Commission Resolution No. 13042 approving findings related to the Eight Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of the Planning Code.
Vacancy Control

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City's rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City's rent control law, which went into effect June 13, 1979, limits rent increases for current tenants in certain residential units. Annual increases of between 4% and 7% are allowed, depending on increases in the cost of living. The law does not limit, however, the amount of rent a landlord may charge a new tenant after the current tenant moves out.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed a Vacancy Control Ordinance. For vacant units covered by rent control, this ordinance would limit rent increases for new tenants who move in on or after July 1, 1991. Before the ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would approve the Vacancy Control Ordinance. Under the ordinance, a landlord could charge a new tenant between 10% and 14% more than the rent paid by the last tenant, depending on how long the last tenant had lived in the unit. This increase would be allowed only once every three years. In addition, a landlord could charge allowable annual increases not charged to the last tenant back to June 13, 1979, when rent control went into effect. Landlords also could seek initial rents above this 10% to 14% limit if the last tenant moved in before June 13, 1979.

A landlord would have to give a new tenant a detailed written statement of how the allowable rent was determined. The tenant could have the Rent Board staff review the statement and approve the rent. If either the landlord or tenant did not agree with the result, either could use the existing appeals process.

Violations of the ordinance could result in the tenant recovering overpaid rent, plus punitive damages. It would be a misdemeanor to charge more than the allowable rent.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to go into effect.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to be rejected.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, there should be no effect on the cost of government.

How "M" Got on the Ballot

On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition M to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 9, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 30,502 of the signatures submitted were valid, 11,704 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Vacancy Control

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a fair compromise that protects tenants from completely unlimited rent increases and allows an increase equal to twice inflation or more for landlords who have acted fairly.

Proposition M will put an end to completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments. It will close the loophole in our Rent Law that has fueled the skyrocketing of rents to unreasonable levels.

Without vacancy control, there is a huge incentive to evict in order to get that unrestricted rent increase. And unfortunately some landlords respond to that incentive to evict, simply to hike up the rent. The elderly, the disabled, long term tenants, and lower income people are the victims.

Proposition M will replace these completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula based on the length of time the previous tenant lived there, how big the rent increases have been in the past, and increases in the landlords costs.

Landlords can raise the rent 10% on a vacant apartment if the previous tenant lived there five years or less, 12% if that previous tenant moved out after six years, and 14% if the tenant moved out after seven years or more.

The Fair Landlord provision of Proposition M protects landlords who have not raised their tenants’ rent each year. When the tenant moves out the landlord may raise the rent on the vacant apartment to what the rent would have been if they had raised it each year. And that’s in addition to the 10%, 12%, or 14% increase. Proposition M is essential to maintain affordable housing in San Francisco.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Hallinan, Maher, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh and Kennedy

Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vacancy Control is opposed by a broad cross-section of citizens from every community in our city.

Vacancy Control makes false promises.

Vacancy Control promises fewer evictions.

IN FACT, evictions have declined by 2/3rds in San Francisco between 1986 and 1991.

Vacancy Control promises affordable housing.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control in Berkeley and Santa Monica has led to a reduction in the supply of affordable rental units.

Vacancy Control advocates promise that the Rent Control bureaucracy will not grow larger and more expensive.

IN FACT, the rent control bureaucracies in Berkeley and Santa Monica have grown 10 times more expensive after Vacancy Control was implemented — costing tenants millions more in higher rents and taxes.

Vacancy Control promises to lower rents.

IN FACT, tenants will be forced to pay higher rents when the costs of building improvements are added to monthly rent bills.

Vacancy Control promises a better city.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control will permanently damage our city.

Since 75% of the S.F. housing stock was built before 1940, improvements and repairs are necessary to keep rental units maintained. By writing a law which encourages owners not to improve their property, Vacancy Control will lead to declining neighborhoods and declining property values.

All bad laws begin with a false promise. Don’t be deceived by the many false promises of Vacancy Control.

NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing

Barbara Kolesar

Executive Director
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M — VACANCY CONTROL WILL RAISE RENTS FOR TENANTS AND LOWER PROPERTY VALUES FOR HOMEOWNERS. VOTE NO ON M.

Vacancy control is a failed social experiment, imported from Berkeley and Santa Monica, that will create higher rents, deteriorating neighborhoods, a costly Rent Board bureaucracy, and lower property values in our city. San Francisco tenants and home owners must not become Vacancy Control's next victim.

RENTERS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.

By limiting increases on vacant units, Proposition M will give landlords incentive to raise rents beyond the 4% cap by passing through on monthly bills: 1) improvements such as painting, a new roof, remodeling etc; 2) increases in the operations and maintenance of your building; 3) utility rate increases, and; 4) increases of debt service for loans.

Also, your present $8.00 per year Rent Board tax will grow to over $100.00 when the Rent Board requires registration of units to police Vacancy Control. Vacancy Control removes incentives for apartment owners to maintain property — hurting poor renters first and leading to massive deterioration of rental property.

LONG TERM TENANTS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.

PASSTHROUGH rent increases have occurred in only 15% of units. To benefit transient tenants, Vacancy Control will raise rents for stable tenants by giving landlords the incentive to implement PASSTHROUGHS for every building and every unit.

VOTE NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.
HOMEOWNERS BEWARE!

Proposition M creates a $10 million annual bureaucracy when vital services to our neighborhoods such as police, fire and libraries are being cut. Vacancy Control lowers home values by encouraging the spread of urban decay to every neighborhood in our city.

To many homeowners, a home represents life savings and secure retirement.

Home values must be protected.

NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The opponents of Proposition M are the official lobbyists for the biggest landlords and real estate developers in the City.

They represent those interests well and we respect them for it.

But when they pretend to represent tenants and homeowners — well, it just isn’t believable. In fact, if they did that, they would not be doing the job they are paid to do.

The landlords and developers say Proposition M will raise rents. If this was true — why would they oppose it?

They are opposing Proposition M because it replaces completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula, using the existing system without cost to city government.

Under Proposition M, landlords could still raise rents by up to 14% on vacant apartments. That’s three times the rate of inflation. Rents could, under proposition M, be raised by even more if they haven’t been raised each year.

These are fair increases that protect renters and landlords.

The City Controller states that “Proposition M will have no effect on the cost of Government.”

The analysis by the impartial ballot simplification committee confirms that the “existing appeals process,” not registration, is used. There is no $10 Million bureaucracy.

Realtors and the city’s largest landlords don’t like Proposition M because it will treat both landlords and tenants fairly. They don’t like Proposition M because it will work.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Limiting rent increases on vacant apartments is essential to preserving the affordable apartments we have left in our city. Without vacancy control, rents more than doubled during the 1980s. According to City Planning statistics, only 30% of our city’s households can now afford the price of a two-bedroom apartment.

Because of severe cutbacks in state and federal funding, the City cannot build affordable units fast enough to replace those lost due to rent increases. We risk losing affordable housing every time an apartment becomes vacant and the landlord is free to raise the rent without limit.

The legislation passed by the Board and signed by Mayor Agnos will not deprive any apartment owner of a fair return on his or her investment. It provides a mechanism for adjusting rents for good landlords who have not raised the rent for many years and who might suffer if only allowed a flat percentage increase.

Proposition M helps protect all San Francisco residents. Please help save affordable housing by voting yes on Proposition M.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I have consistently supported vacancy control because it is needed to keep San Francisco affordable for people from all walks of life.

This vacancy control law is both fair and reasonable. To save vacancy control, please join me in voting YES on Proposition M.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments are just too big an incentive for many landlords to resist. Unfair evictions of long term and elderly tenants are the frequent result. We know because we see it happening every day. Proposition M cuts this eviction incentive, allows reasonable increases, and uses the existing Rent Board system. Vote yes on M!

Polly Marshall, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Denice Stephenson, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Vivian Hamill, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Jake McGoldrick, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner

San Francisco’s lesbian and gay community always has shown leadership on issues of fairness. That’s why all of our community’s elected officials fought so long and hard for the vacancy control law that is Proposition M.

Proposition M is fair to conscientious landlords who keep rents low for elderly, disabled or low-income tenants, it allows bonus rent increases on vacated apartments that have been kept below market rate.

Proposition M is fair to tenants because it ensures that San Francisco will have affordable, well-maintained apartments in the future.

Don’t believe the scare tactics of the real estate industry. Once again they’re raising the ridiculous argument that San Francisco will become a slum. The truth is, property values are skyrocketing, and nobody in their right mind is going to lose money in San Francisco real estate.

Resist the real estate industry’s expensive smokescreen campaign of deception and distortion. Stand up for a fair balance between the needs of landlords and tenants. Vote YES on M!

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

We as members of the Latino community in San Francisco support Proposition M, which will provide for control over the rents of vacant apartments.

The accelerated rise in rental housing prices over the last decade have made it increasingly difficult for working class Latino families to afford living in San Francisco. Proposition M will remove an important incentive for eviction of long term tenants, relieve overcrowding, and slow down the process of gentrification currently afflicting our neighborhoods.

Ruth Picon
Jose Medina
Maria Martinez
Commissioner Jim Morales
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The Justice and Peace Commission of the Archdiocese of San Francisco has been on record as supportive of some vacancy control measures since this legislation was introduced. I quote from the Catholic Bishops Pastoral: Economic Justice For All; "Economic decisions have human consequences and moral content; they help or hurt people, strengthen or weaken family life, advance or diminish the quality of justice in our land."

More and more people are not making it, especially families. They have the right to affordable housing. We believe that the present rent control law, while providing needed assistance to renters, does not go far enough. The lack of vacancy control provides a loophole that actually encourages some landlords, as I believe that most are honest, to encourage tenants to move out. As a result, the stock of rental units for low income people, and middle class people, continues to be depleted.

This is a fair ordinance, but, moreover, it is something we should do for the common good, for the good of the poorest among us, for the good of those families who want to live in the City and struggle to do so.

Justice and Peace Commission
Archdiocese of San Francisco

Proposition M is fair to landlords and provides needed protection for tenants. I know because I sponsored Prop. M only after an extensive series of meetings between landlords and tenants.

Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Proposition M would:

- Allow landlords 10%, 12%, or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there.
- Reward landlords who kept the rent low by allowing a further increase to recover past yearly increases they didn’t give.
- Let landlords who got caught with low rents when rent control first came in catch up.

And existing law already provides for:

- Annual increases pegged to inflation.
- Increases that cover the costs of work done on apartments.

Stop unfair and completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments! Vote yes on M.

Doris Ward
President, Board of Supervisors

Stop unlimited rent increases — Vote yes on M!

Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Community Tenants Association
David Spero
Richmond District Democratic Club

Don’t buy the developers bull! They can raise the rent to cover inflation, the cost of any work they do to the apartment, and to cover any increase in operating or maintenance costs.

Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Prop. M would cap those increases to an amount equal to twice the rate of inflation.

If your salary or business’ income went up like that, you’d probably think it was more than fair.

But the big landlords and realtors aren’t satisfied, they want even more!

Tell the real estate lobby not to be so greedy. Tell them Prop M is fair. Vote yes on M!

Affordable Housing Alliance

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges you to VOTE YES on Prop. M.

Friendly pedestrian neighborhoods near jobs and markets get residents out of their cars. When high rents make neighborhoods less affordable, or tenants are threatened with evictions so rents can be raised, neighborhoods become less stable and friendly. People move to the suburbs where they drive three times as much, polluting the air and consuming more energy. This in turn fuels the arguments of the oil industry which wants to drill for oil in the Arctic and other pristine areas, and further threatens our coasts from tankers.

Keep San Francisco neighborhoods stable and friendly. VOTE YES ON PROP M.

League of Conservation Voters
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Advocates for homeless people agree; homelessness is caused by San Francisco’s high rents. The only long-term solution to homelessness is to give homeless people a chance to get off the streets and take control of their lives. Prop M will enable homeless people to rent their own apartments by lowering the cost of moving in.
The Real Estate Lobby profits from high rents and homelessness by opposing Prop M, and spreads falsehoods which cloak their true responsibility for the human misery real estate speculation and rent-gouging have created.

HOMELESSNESS WILL ONLY BE SOLVED BY ENSURING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

YES ON M!

Coalition On Homelessness

Thousands of affordable apartments will be lost unless we vote yes on Proposition M.

Why? Because there are thousands of apartments that are affordable now, but when the current tenants move, the rent will go through the roof, thanks to the loophole in our Rent Law that allows unlimited rent increases.

Proposition M will fix this loophole and protect tenants and affordable housing. Instead of unlimited increases, landlords could get 10%, 12% or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there. Landlords could get more if they had not raised the rent each year.

Proposition M is fair to landlords and will provide needed protection to tenants. Vote yes on M.

Assemblyman John Burton

46% of San Francisco renters pay more than 30% of their income in rent. For poor households, the percentage of income spent on rent is even higher — between 50% and 70%!* Don’t allow rents to get any higher! Keep vacancy control — Vote Yes on M!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
St. Peter’s Housing Committee

* according to Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1990

The San Francisco Tenants Union — the largest tenant counseling organization in the city — urges a YES vote on Proposition M.

San Francisco Tenants Union

Reasonable limits on rent increases will maintain affordability and protect the diversity San Francisco is famous for. Vote Yes on M!

San Francisco Tomorrow

This is a fair measure that was written during a three-year period of negotiations in which people on both sides made concessions. It fights hyper-inflated rent increases which continue to drive working and middle-class people out of San Francisco. Some landlords and realtors decided that if they couldn’t have it all their way, then they would agree to nothing — and spend one million dollars to see that tenants get nothing. Don’t be deceived by all their money. Proposition M will help keep San Francisco affordable. Please vote “yes”.

Mayor Art Agnos

Recently, I was contacted by a Marina resident who angrily recalled signing a petition “to reduce rents”. Deception and intimidation being the landlords’ and realtors’ strategy, it’s vital to know who’s behind the No on M campaign:

Clint Reilly unsatisfied with his millions from big insurance companies, wants one last killing before driving off into early retirement in his Yuppymobile...

Jack Davis squanders tenants’ rent money on food fights in plush eateries with buddies like the Mitchell Brothers while the homeless and hungry press noses to the window in despair and disbelief.

And the landlords and realtors who hired them include condo conversion crooks Bill Rosetti and Leona Helmsley.

Do you expect the truth from these vermin?

Send them a message! VOTE YES!

Brian Doohan
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In 1988 the Vacancy Control Campaign gathered over 100,000 votes in favor of a far stronger measure despite being outspent 40-1. Since opponents of Proposition M again have an overwhelming abundance of cash matched by their utter absence of integrity, it’s important to remember some lowlights of 1988:

Shortly after extorting the support of apartment maintenance workers, the landlords mailed thousands of flyers featuring a corrupt building manager accepting a television for an apartment referral. That’s how the landlords treat their friends!

Another piece of junk mail attempted to intimidate renters by bragging that landlords would raise rents through pass-throughs and let buildings fall into disrepair. Today, without vacancy control, the Department of Public Works has a backlog of over 700 buildings with life-threatening violations.

And after falsely claiming enforcement would cost $43,000,000 in 1988, the same landlords are using lack of registration as reason to vote against Proposition M.

Remember, every lying billboard, radio commercial or junk mailer against Proposition M was paid for by the rents of hard working San Franciscans who have enough trouble keeping a roof over their head.

Don’t believe the landlords’ bull! Vote YES.

The Vacancy Control Campaign

Proposition M was put on the ballot by landlords in an attempt to repeal the Board of Supervisors’ recently-passed vacancy control measure.

We need stricter vacancy control, a rent freeze and a ban on evictions. Housing is a right!

Gloria Estela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports vacancy control. We have fought for a measure like Proposition M for a decade. Without vacancy control, rents in vacant apartments have skyrocketed. This loophole in the City’s rent control law also created an incentive for landlords to evict tenants.

Proposition M is a fair law to protect tenants and allow landlords a fair rate of return. The opponents of Proposition M who put this on the ballot are motivated by unlimited profit, not the well-being of tenants.

Rents in San Francisco are already too high. Let’s put a lid on unlimited rent increases!

 Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco County Democratic Party

Connie O’Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Catherine J. Dodd, RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Shirley B. Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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San Francisco cannot afford the Proposition M vacancy control scheme.
Not only is vacancy control a proven failed housing policy, it will harm our city’s economy, cost millions in lost revenue, and result in reduced services.
In other cities, vacancy control has failed to achieve its promised benefits, destroying rental housing, ruining neighborhoods and discouraging investment in housing. Do not burden San Francisco with another destructive ordinance.
Keep San Francisco’s economy strong.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

History shows that every city that has tried vacancy control has ended up with more housing problems. Berkeley has lost over 13% of its rental housing since it enacted vacancy control. Thirteen percent of the San Francisco rental housing supply is 26,000 units. Tenants and the city would be in terrible shape if San Francisco repeated the Berkeley experience and thereby lost 26,000 rent units.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Honorable James Fang, BART Board Member
Honorable Michael Bernick, BART Board Member
Honorable Chuck Ayala, Community College Board

Once again the city’s electorate is being asked to vote on vacancy control. Three times the voters have voted it down, but here we are again!
Under the best of circumstances administering vacancy control will cost between $15-20 million.
Doesn’t the city have enough demands on its revenue sources? Many of our existing programs are in need of funding — why then build yet another bureaucracy?
Vote NO on Prop. M.

Bob Ross, Publisher
BAR (Bay Area Reporter)

If vacancy control passes, it would be a devastating blow to the construction industry which employs about 25,000 people.
As the incentive for property owners to fix up their buildings is eliminated, the erosion of badly needed jobs will be quickly realized. WHO NEEDS VACANCY CONTROL?
VOTE NO!

Joe O’Donoghue, President
Residential Builders Association

Funding for AIDS not bureaucracy!
Vote No on vacancy control.

Ray Chalker, Publisher
The Sentinel

We strongly encourage you to vote No on Proposition M.
Vacancy control is harmful to the interests of renters, home and apartment owners. It can cause decay in our neighborhoods.
Vacancy control has had negative impacts in the other California cities. Don’t let it harm San Francisco.
Please Join us in voting No on Vacancy control.

Bok F. Pon, Executive Director
Chinese American Outreach Program
Bill Chin, Former Chairman of Chinese Consolidate Assn.
Stephen Quan, Chairman of Hoy Ping Assn.
Kwok Ying Tang
Thomas H. Gee
Timothy H. Lau

As the former Assessor and Controller of San Francisco, we can assure you that vacancy control will reduce the amount of property taxes collected from rental property. San Francisco cannot afford a reduction in tax revenues. We urge you to vote NO on Prop. M.

Samuel Duca, Former Assessor
John C. Farrell, Controller,
City and County of San Francisco, Retired
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San Francisco does not need vacancy control. Market forces have kept rent increases for vacant apartments well below the inflation rate for over 5 years. There are thousands of vacant apartments in a broad price range available here for renters to choose from. Just check the Sunday papers.

We have served on the San Francisco Rent Stabilization Board for many years now and have observed a steady decrease in owners applying to impose pass-through rent increases. Renter complaints alleging unfair practices, such as decreased services or wrongful eviction, have also declined dramatically in recent years. Our current reasonable law has worked to stabilize rents and to bring some peace to rental housing relations in our city. Vacancy control will reverse that positive trend.

Currently, renters in San Francisco pay no more than $8 per year to operate our Rent Board. With vacancy control, rent board administrative costs will increase if Berkeley and Santa Monica can be used as examples. Renters in Berkeley and Santa Monica pay from $132 to $136 per year per apartment to pay for vacancy control. Few renters in Berkeley or Santa Monica will ever benefit from vacancy control. You won’t benefit from it in San Francisco either. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Rent Board Commissioners:
Tim Carrico
Manie How

Alternate Rent Board Commissioners:
Mike Rossoff
Bill Villa

The Planning Association for the Richmond, one of the city’s largest neighborhood associations has fought to maintain affordable housing and livable neighborhoods.

Vacancy control threatens those efforts. It will result in fewer rental units, poorly maintained buildings and declining city revenues — all without adding new protection for existing tenants.

PAR’s board of directors urges both renters and homeowners to vote NO on Proposition M.

Jim Lazarus, President
Planning Association for the Richmond

As former city commissioners, we know that vacancy control is not part of a sound housing plan.
VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Nancy Lenvin, Former Pres, Public Utilities Commission
Preston Cook, Former Housing Authority Commissioner
Bruce Lilienthal, Founding Pres,
S.F. Small Business Advisory Commission

As Chair of the Board of Supervisors’ Finance Committee I demanded an economic impact report of vacancy control prior to the Board’s vote. I regret that this evaluation was not done.

The evidence from other cities strongly supports my belief that vacancy control will result in property owners seeking reassessments from the Assessor for their apartment buildings. Lower tax revenues mean a weak tax base and less resources to carry out vital city and human services.

Proposition M is fiscally irresponsible. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

As former supervisor I supported the current law.
I would vote again for the rent control ordinance, since it protects tenants-in-place. But would never support vacancy control.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Gordon Lau, Former Supervisor

Vacancy control does nothing to help low-income rental households. What we need is an earmarked fund that we can use to target subsidies for those who need them. Vacancy control, all too often, subsidizes new, upper income households that do not need assistance.

Additionally, vacancy control discourages the investment of small property ownership. We don’t want this city’s housing stock owned by only large investors.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie B. Kennedy, Member,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a POOR EXCUSE FOR A HOUSING POLICY. What San Francisco needs is a realistic, economically viable, socially progressive housing policy and this is not it!

Who wins under this new scenario? High-income wage-earners, who do not need this assistance, have their rents held in check while lower-income folks trying to get into the market are held back due to the increased competition for below-market values.

Not one cent should be wasted on such an undirected program. Help those who need help and keep effective incentives in place — we need rent control, but not vacancy control.

VOTE NO ON THIS MEASURE.

Joy Hahn  
San Francisco Tenant

AS PROPERTY MANAGERS, WE ARE THE BENEFICIARIES of this legislation since we would choose the tenants for the below-market rental units. Yet we remain strongly opposed: Vacancy Control (VC) removes the last remaining market incentive for an owner to do a good job of taking care of their buildings. This policy encourages deterioration of our famed San Francisco housing stock as well as removes apartments from the available supply.

VC IS UNFAIR TO IN-PLACE TENANTS. New tenants could pay less than long-standing residents. Plus long-standing tenants could expect greater annual rent increases than their new better-off yuppie neighbors. Does this make sense? The ever-growing bureaucracy is the only winner with VC.

VC ENCOURAGES DISCRIMINATION against newcomers and low-income renters. Just try renting in Berkeley as a newcomer if you doubt this fact.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TOO IMPORTANT for us to continue to expend so much negative energy fighting about a stupid yuppie housing subsidy like VC. Let's move ahead not backwards on affordable housing. Let's work together to build affordable housing. Please, let's vote No on M to stop Vacancy Control.

Chris Collins, Vice President  
Jeanne Armstrong, 1990 President  
Professional Property Management Association of San Francisco

I urge you to vote no on Proposition M. It is clear that those who support vacancy control have failed to consider its harmful effects on both renters and our City. We must implement housing programs that will encourage and provide low and moderate income housing, not discourage and stop it. We must encourage programs that will upgrade and repair existing rental housing as well as providing solutions to the earthquake dangers in unreinforced masonry buildings. We cannot afford to experiment with a program that promises improvements, but has failed to provide them in every city in which it has been tried.

Vote NO on Proposition M. Thank you.

John L. Molinari, Former President and Member  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Controls do not work. Rental controls on vacant housing have been disastrous in New York. The San Francisco Council of District Merchants' Associations represents over 2000 businesses in the neighborhoods of the city.

We oppose vacancy control. Vote No on Proposition M.

Harold M. Hoogastian, President  
San Francisco Council of District Merchants' Associations

Our existing rent ordinance was designed to protect tenants in place by limiting annual rent increases. It has served our city well over more than a decade and shouldn't be changed.

This is one of the most confusing ordinances I have seen in my many years in public office. Try reading it yourself! Its implementation will create an enormous bureaucracy which San Francisco can ill-afford.

What San Francisco needs is the creation of a sound housing policy which will meet the needs of our very diverse city.

Let's stop building more bureaucracy.  
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.,  
Speaker of the Assembly
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We are AIDS activists opposing Proposition M.

Let's look at the facts.

One percent of San Francisco's population has died from AIDS. Another four percent is infected. San Franciscans become infected every day. While the City's response has been admirable, more money is needed.

Each year we are told there is insufficient money to fully fund vital AIDS services such as early intervention treatment and new education efforts for at-risk populations.

Vacancy control regulates rents on empty apartments, but is expensive to administer. Our current rent ordinance is funded by an $8 per unit fee (paid by renters). This will increase dramatically. The cost in California cities which have vacancy control is approximately $136 per unit. For San Francisco that amounts to over $27 million.

New laws for new bureaucracies can hardly be called progressive when implemented at the expense of AIDS funding. Our tax money should be used to save as many lives as possible, not to regulate rents on the empty apartments of our dead friends!!

Vote NO on Proposition M!

Peter N. Fowler
Jessie Dobson
Michael Rossoff
Gordon P. Crespo
David E. Bell
Michael C. Hall

Don't be misled by a few gay and lesbian politicos who support this radical vacancy control measure. They don't speak for our entire community.

We know that vacancy control reduces the quality of rental housing and leads to the loss of units. Many existing tenants will be faced with higher rents.

Most importantly, vacancy control reduces revenues from rental property which is needed to fund vital community services.

Join us in voting NO on Prop. M.

Log Cabin Club
Robert Speer, President

Vacancy Control is a bad idea.

It hurts the poor. Destroys neighborhoods. And costs too much. It's failed in every city where it's been implemented. Berkeley and Santa Monica have vacancy control and have lost minority populations at a much greater rate than other California cities. When artificially capped rents stimulate demand, who gets the apartments? The wealthy, not the poor.

While San Francisco added thousands of rental units under the previous mayor, Berkeley and Santa Monica each lost thousands of units. Owners went out of business because they were losing money. Builders stopped building because they couldn't recapture costs. The eroded tax base now provides less money for essential services.

We can't afford vacancy control. Its administration will cost millions. Proponents' claims to the contrary are false. Santa Monica's original rent board budget was a few hundred thousand. Now it's $4.6 million. Berkeley's is $2.2 million.

San Francisco's rent board is financed by an $8 per unit fee (renters pay this either directly or it's included in their rent). Berkeley's unit tax began at $12 per unit. With vacancy control it's now $136. For San Francisco's approximately 200,000 units, that amounts to $27.2 million.

San Francisco renters are smarter than the politicians think, and would prefer spending their money wisely. Like providing AIDS services, helping the homeless, or cleaning our streets — not building bureaucracy, ruining our housing, and displacing minorities.

Voters have repeatedly rejected vacancy control. We're tired of the games.

Stop the madness!

Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Apartment Association
Committee to Preserve Rental Housing
Joseph K. Bravo, President

Rent control, as it exists now, works well for the tenants of this city. Anything more stringent would be a disincentive to the creation of more housing — something we are in desperate need of.

VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Jane Winslow
Community Activist
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Vacancy control is a flawed policy. It discourages landlords from maintaining buildings. It encourages tenants who are moving out to sell their leases to the highest bidder, not to the needy. And studies show that it gentrifies neighborhoods, not the other way around.

I have supported reasonable rent control. Under the current law, San Francisco rents have stabilized or have dropped due to market pressures.

More restrictive vacancy control doesn’t help low income renters because it creates an expensive new bureaucracy, paid for by renters. In San Francisco, the annual tax on renters to feed this bureaucracy could exceed $150. Current tenants would not benefit.

The history of vacancy control is a failed social and housing policy. It often subsidized the rich while it hurts lower income and minority families. It is a cruel hoax. Let’s not repeat that mistake in San Francisco.

Please join me in voting No on Proposition M.

Supervisor Bill Maher

Jobs are the lifeline that separate one from the ability to pay rent, meet one’s mortgage obligation or become homeless.

In the last few years, this city has witnessed an unbelievable erosion of job opportunities. Not just for construction workers, but at all levels of the job market.

This is the resultant of neanderthal governmental regulations.

The enactment of vacancy control will assure fewer jobs in all areas of the housing industry.

Vote NO on Prop. M.

Local Union No. 38
Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry

Small Business has frequently been cited as the cornerstone of the San Francisco economy. We work here and we live here. We are opposed to vacancy control because we know it will have an adverse effect in the creation of housing for our customers and our employees.

* We urge you to vote No on Proposition M.

Andrew R. Eben, Vice President
Small Business Network

The full burden of vacancy control will fall on small and new property owners, many of whom are and will be Asian American, unable to afford the professional staff that will be required to deal with the complex and constantly changing rules and regulations. It is the small community property home-owner which will suffer. Moreover, there is no evidence that cities with vacancy control have been able to improve or house low income or minority households. Vacancy control is a detriment to our community’s desire to fully contribute to American society.

James Fang, Executive Director,
Asian American Voter Project

As most of the world embraces free market economic policies, City Hall persists with unnecessary regulatory infringement on the rights of San Francisco property owners. We Republicans favor the retention of a free market for rental housing as a productive means to ensure affordable housing for all San Francisco residents. Therefore, we strongly oppose the addition of a vacancy control amendment to the existing rent ordinance.

Stringent vacancy control ordinances in other jurisdictions have led to the loss of rental units, deterioration of apartment buildings and the surrounding neighborhoods, weakened economic and fiscal health of the community, discrimination against low and moderate income and minority families, harm to the environment, and unfair infringement on the rights of rental property owners to earn a reasonable return on investment.

For those who wish to restore fiscal integrity and a robust economy to our City, the choice is easy.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
L. Kirk Miller, Chair
Sam T. Harper
James E. Gillinan
Cristina I. Mack
Christopher L. Bowman
Mark D. Hill
Bok F. Pon

Jun R. Hatoyma
K. Martin Keller
Albert C. Chang
Pablo Wong
Stephen D. Mayer
Joanne S. Stevens
Arthur Bruzzone
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Vacancy control (Proposition M on the Ballot) is an ineffective housing policy by any perspective. There are compelling arguments why it should be rejected.

• Vacancy control does not preserve housing for low- and moderate-income families. In communities with vacancy control, poor families are at a substantial disadvantage. By restricting rent levels, vacancy control forces housing providers to turn to other factors, such as income and credit worthiness, to choose among prospective tenants.

• By reducing the return on investment, vacancy control will lead to marked reductions in expenditures for building maintenance and repair. Over time, these reduced expenditures will take their toll on rental properties and the quality of housing services provided to tenants.

• Vacancy control will destroy the incentive for developers to build new rental units in San Francisco. Although San Francisco exempts new units from rent control, developers generally do not believe that communities which adopt stringent forms of rent control will refrain from eventually putting new units under controls, as New York City did. Hence, San Francisco’s housing shortage will get worse.

• The drop in real estate values brought about by vacancy control will lead to an erosion of San Francisco’s property tax base. Vacancy control does not result in long term benefits for either tenants or the community.

Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Association of Realtors
Helen Dawson, President

We strongly encourage San Franciscans to reject vacancy control by voting No on Proposition M.

Vacancy Control is harmful to the long-term ability of San Francisco to solve its pressing housing, social and financial problems. We need practical and effective solutions. Proposition M will create new problems. It will not solve our city’s existing problems.

We should be investing in our city’s future not voting for propositions that drag it down.

Thank you for joining us in voting No on Proposition M.

Allen Okamoto
Jackson Wong
John Fang
Anton Qui
Pablo Wong

Florence Fang
Yvonne Lee
Ivan Wong
Peter Yu

Homeowners Beware!

Passage of Proposition M will lead to the deterioration of San Francisco’s neighborhoods. It will also result in a reduction in property values. Vacancy control has had these effects in other cities.

Don’t be fooled into voting for vacancy control because you believe it will help renters. Evidence from other communities shows that it harms low-income and minority families, leads to poorer apartment quality and increases rents for current tenants.

Vacancy control will reduce taxes from apartments, resulting in fewer services for our neighborhoods and, possibly, increased taxes and fees for homeowners.

Please join us in voting No on Proposition M.

San Francisco Homeowners’ Council
Tim Carrico, President
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AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A AND 37.11A THEREOF, TO ESTABLISH LIMITATIONS ON INITIAL RENTS FOR RENTAL UNITS, CREATE A PROCEDURE FOR VERIFICATION OF INITIAL RENTS, PROVIDE FOR ARBITRATION OF INITIAL RENTS, EXPAND FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED BY HEARING OFFICERS, CREATE A NEW CRIMINAL PENALTY AND ENLARGE THE SCOPE OF CIVIL ACTIONS.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Sections 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A and 37.11A thereof to read as follows:

Sec. 37.3. Rent Limitations.

(a) Rent Increase Limitations for Tenants in Occupancy. Landlords may impose rent increases upon tenants in occupancy only as provided below:

(1) Annual Rent Increase. On March 1 of each year, the Board shall publish the increase in the CPI for the preceding 12 months, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor. A landlord may impose annually a rent increase which does not exceed a tenant's base rent by more than 60% of said published increase. In no event, however, shall the allowable annual increase be less than 4% or greater than 7%.

(2) Banking. A landlord who refrains from imposing an annual rent increase or any portion thereof may accumulate said increase and impose that amount on the tenant's subsequent rent increase anniversary dates. A landlord who, between April 1, 1982 and February 29, 1984, has banked for an annual 7% rent increase (or rent increases) or any portion thereof may impose the accumulated increase on the tenant's subsequent rent increase anniversary dates.

(3) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may impose rent increases based upon the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation or energy conservation measures provided that such costs are certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(4) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(a) above.

(5) Charges Related to Excess Water Use. A landlord may impose increases not to exceed fifty percent of the excess use charges (penalties) levied by the San Francisco Water Department on a building for use of water in excess of Water Department allocations under the following conditions:

(A) The landlord provides tenants with written certification that the following have been installed in all units: (1) permanently-installed retrofit devices designed to reduce the amount of water used per flush or low-flow toilets (1.6 gallons per flush); (2) low-flow showerheads which allow a flow of no more than 2.5 gallons per minute; and (3) faucet aerators where installation on current faucets is physically feasible; and

(B) The landlord provides the tenants with written certification that no known plumbing leaks currently exist in the building and that any leaks reported by tenants in the future will be promptly repaired; and

(C) The landlord provides the tenants with a copy of the water bill for the period in which the penalty was charged. Only penalties billed for a service period which begins after the effective date of the ordinance may be passed through to tenants. Where penalties result from an allocation which does not reflect documented changes in occupancy which occurred after March 1, 1991, a landlord must, if requested in writing by a tenant, make a good faith effort to appeal the allotment. Increases based upon penalties shall be pro-rated on a per room basis provided that the tenancy existed during the time the penalty charges accrued. Such charges shall not become part of a tenant's base rent. Where a penalty in any given billing period reflects a 25% or more increase in consumption over the prior billing period, and where that increase does not appear to result from increased occupancy or any other known use, a landlord may not impose any increase based upon such penalty unless inspection by a licensed plumber or Water Department inspector fails to reveal a plumbing or other leak. If the inspection does reveal a leak, no increase based upon penalties may be imposed at any time for the period of the unrepaired leak.

(6) RAP Loans. A landlord may impose rent increases attributable to the Chief Administrative Officer's amortization of the RAP loan in an area designated on or after July 1, 1977 pursuant to Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(7) Additional Increases. A landlord who seeks to impose any rent increase which exceeds those permitted above shall petition for a rental arbitration hearing pursuant to Section 37.8 of this chapter.

(8) Limitation on All Increases. Notwithstanding any other provision of Section 37.3, where a hearing officer, pursuant to Section 37.8(b)(7), has ordered that a tenant receive no increases because the landlord has failed to substantiate the Initial rent, the increases set forth in Section 37.3(a)(1-4) shall not be allowed.

(b) Notice of Rent Increase for Tenants in Occupancy. On or before the date upon which a landlord gives a tenant legal notice of a rent increase, the landlord shall inform the tenant, in writing, of the following:

(1) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the annual increase, and/or a banked amount, if any;

(2) Which portion of the rent increase reflects costs for capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures certified pursuant to Section 37.7;

(3) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the pass through of charges for gas and electricity, which charges shall be explained;

(4) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the amortization of the RAP loan, as described in Section 37.5(a)(6) above.

(5) Nonconforming Rent Increases. Any rent increase which does not conform with the provisions of this section shall be null and void.

(c) Initial Rent Limitation for Subtenants. A tenant who subleases his or her rental unit may charge no more rent upon initial occupancy of the subtenant or subtenants than that rent which the tenant is currently paying to the landlord.

(d) Establishment of Initial Rents.

(1) For tenants occupying a rental unit pursuant to a tenancy which begins on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge no more than the base rent of the previous tenancy plus the amounts listed below, as applicable:

A Vacancy Allowance. A landlord may charge an additional 2% per year over the base rent of the previous tenancy provided that the calculation of such figure begins on or after April 1, 1982. In no event, however, shall the vacancy allowance be less than 10% or more than 14%. In addition, this allowance shall not be imposed unless the previous tenancy was terminated either voluntarily by the tenant or pursuant to a lawful eviction under Section 37.9(a) below. This allowance shall also not be imposed more than once in any given 36-months period beginning on or after July 1, 1991.

(B) Banking.

(i) A landlord may charge any amounts which the landlord has banked with respect to the previous tenancy pursuant to Section 37.3(a)(2).

(ii) A landlord may also charge any annual rent increases which the landlord could lawfully have imposed with respect to the previous tenancy between June 13, 1979 and March 31, 1982 but refrained from imposing, provided that such increases do not exceed 7% per year for this period.

(C) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may charge for capital improvements or rehabilitation or energy conservation measures which have been certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(D) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(a) above.

(E) Fair Landlord Adjustments.

(i) CPI Adjustment. Where a pre-June 13, 1979 tenancy terminates on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge an increase equivalent to 60% of the annual increase in the Consumer Price Index, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor, for each year prior to June 13, 1979, provided that such increases were not imposed during this period.
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riod. This adjustment shall be calculated prior to all other calculations of increases and allowances permitted under Section 37.3(d).

(ii) Fair Market Adjustment. As an alternative to the CPI adjustment permitted in subsection (i) above, a landlord may petition the Board for a hearing to determine the fair market value of the unit on June 13, 1979 where the landlord claims that the rent charged on that date was less than market rent for comparable units and where the pre-June 13, 1979 tenancy terminates on or after July 1, 1991. Evidence shall include, but not be limited to, rents as advertised for that neighborhood in the local newspaper during the week of June 13, 1979, which advertisements shall be available at the Board. This adjustment is only available if a similar adjustment for the unit has not been granted by the Board under Section 37.8(b)(4)(B).

(ii) The purpose of subsections (d)(1)(E) above is to assure that landlords who have had long-term tenants with historically low rents pre-dating June 13, 1979 receive fair rents upon the first new tenancy commencing on or after July 1, 1991, the date upon which this Chapter first established limitations on initial rents.

(iii) Notwithstanding the limits on the establishment of initial rents set forth in subsection (d)(1) above, where a unit not subject to this Chapter on July 1, 1991 subsequently becomes subject to this Chapter, there shall be no limit on the initial rent charged.

(iv) The limits on the establishment of initial rents set forth in subsection (d)(1) above shall not apply to units vacated and re-rented pursuant to Sections 37.9(a)(13) and 37.9A.

(v) Nothing in the establishment of initial rents shall prohibit a landlord from seeking other increases permissible under this Chapter.

(vi) Landlord Disclosure of Allowable Initial Rents.

(i) For each rental unit offered for rent where a new tenancy is to begin on or after July 1, 1991, the landlord shall provide each prospective tenant with a written rent disclosure statement. The statement, which shall be signed and dated by the landlord under penalty of perjury, shall include the following, separately stated, as applicable:

(A) Previous Rent. The base rent of the previous tenancy.

(B) Vacancy Allowance. Any increase permitted by Section 37.3(d)(1)(A) above.

(C) Banking. Any amount which the landlord has banked with respect to the previous tenancy pursuant to Section 37.3(d)(1)(B) above.

(D) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation and Energy Conservation Measures. Amounts for such work which have been certified pursuant to Section 37.7 plus those amounts for which the landlord has filed a petition with the Board. The landlord shall attach any Board decision under which the landlord received authorization for such pass-throughs, plus any petition for future pass-throughs filed with the Board.

(E) Utilities. Amounts for the increased cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(a) above.

(F) CPI Adjustment. Any CPI adjustment increases permitted under Section 37.3(d)(1)(E)(I) above, if a landlord chooses this alternative.

(G) Total Rent. The above items shall be totaled. This total is the allowable rent for any tenancy which begins on or after July 1, 1991; provided, however, that any amount which reflects capital improvements not yet certified by the Board is subject to change upon certification.

(H) Fair Market Adjustment. If a landlord chooses this adjustment as an alternative to the CPI adjustment in (F) above, the landlord shall state that he/she seeks this adjustment and shall file a petition with the Board no later than 240 days after the commencement of the tenancy. This time limit is mandatory and therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(I) Rent Board Information. The disclosure shall also include a statement that information concerning rents which may be lawfully charged in San Francisco is available from the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board.

(J) Verification. The disclosure shall also include a statement that the tenant may seek verification of any information contained in the rent disclosure statement from the Rent Board. Such verification must be sought no later than 240 days after the commencement of the tenancy. This time limit is mandatory and is therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(2) Failure to provide the information required in the rent disclosure statement shall subject the landlord to the penalties set forth in this Chapter.

(K) Review of Rent Limitations upon Initial Occupancy. The limitations upon the establishment of initial rents as set forth in Section 37.3(d) above shall be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors prior to July 1, 1993 and adjusted, if necessary, in order to continue to assure landlords fair and reasonable rents. If the Board fails to review the limitation on initial rents prior to July 1, 1993, the limitation shall expire on said date.

Sec. 37.7. Certification of Rental Increases for Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation and Energy Conservation Measures.

(a) Authority. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to conduct hearings in order to certify rental increases to the extent necessary to amortize the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures. Costs determined to be attributable to such work shall be amortized over a period which is fair and reasonable for the type and the extent of the work and which will provide an incentive to landlords to maintain, improve and renovate their properties while at the same time protecting tenants from excessive rent increases. Costs attributable to routine repair and maintenance shall not be certified.

(b) Requirements for Certification. The Board and designated hearing officers may only certify the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures where the following criteria are met:

(1) The landlord completed capital improvements or rehabilitation on or after April 15, 1979, or the landlord completed installation of energy conservation measures on or after July 24, 1982 and has filed a proof of compliance with the Bureau of Building Inspection in accordance with the requirements of Section 1207(d)(4) of the Housing Code.

(2) The landlord has not yet increased the rent or rents to reflect the cost of said work;

(3) The landlord has not been compensated for the work by insurance proceeds;

(4) The building is not subject to a RAP loan in a RAP area designated prior to July 1, 1977.

(c) Amortization and Cost Allocation. The Board shall establish amortization periods and cost allocation formulas. Costs shall be allocated to each unit according to the benefit of the work attributable to such unit.

(d) Estimator. The Board or its Executive Secretary may hire an estimator where an expert appraisal is required.

(e) Filing Fee. The Board shall establish a filing fee based upon the cost of the capital improvement, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures being reviewed. Such fees will pay for the costs of an estimator. These fees shall be deposited in the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Fund pursuant to Section 10.177-88 of this code.

(f) Application Procedure.

(1) Filing. Landlords who seek to pass through the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures must file an application on a form prescribed by the Board. The application shall be accompanied by such supporting materials as the Board shall prescribe. All applications must be submitted with the filing fee established by the Board.

(2) Filing Date. Applications must be filed prior to (a) the mailing or delivery of legal notice of a rent increase to the tenants in occupancy of units for which the landlord seeks certification; and (b) establishing any initial rent pursuant to Section 37.3(d)(1)(C) above.

(3) Effect of Filing Application. Upon the filing of the application, the requested increases will be inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the certification hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the application for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

(g) Certification Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing shall be held within 45 days of the filing of the application.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, certification hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated. Where a
landlord and/or tenant has filed a petition for hearing based upon the grounds and under the procedure set forth in Section 37.8, the Board may, in its discretion, consolidate certification hearings with hearings on Section 37.8 petitions.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. Burden of proof is on the landlord. A record of the proceedings shall be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of Hearing Officer. In accordance with the Board's amortization schedules and cost allocation formulas, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the proposed rent increases are justified based upon the following considerations:

(A) The application and its supporting documentation;
(B) Evidence presented at the hearing establishing both the extent and the cost of the work performed;
(C) Estimator's report, where such report has been prepared; and
(D) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in Rules and Regulations.

(5) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed within 30 days of the hearing.

(6) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Certification Decision. If the hearing officer finds that all or any portion of the horrendous inoperative rent increase is justified, the tenant shall be ordered to pay the landlord that amount. If the tenant has paid an amount to the landlord which the hearing officer finds unjustified, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to reimburse the tenant said amount. In either case, however, such an order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party.

(7) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his or her decision on appeal.

(8) Appeals. Either party may file an appeal of the hearing officer's decision with the Board. Such appeals are governed by Section 37.8(f) below.

Sec. 37.8. Arbitration of Rental Increase Adjustments and Verification Procedures.

(a) Authority of Board and Hearing Officers. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to verify initial rents and to arbitrate fair market adjustments, initial rent disputes and rental increase adjustments. The Board shall further have the authority to administer the rent increase protest procedures with respect to RAP rental units as set forth in Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) Verification of Initial Rents.

(1) A tenant whose tenancy begins on or after July 1, 1991 may request a verification from the Board of initial rent. The procedure shall be as follows:

(A) Filing. A request for verification must be filed within 240 days of the tenant's receipt of the rent disclosure statement; provided, however, that where a tenant never receives such a statement, the tenant may file no later than 365 days from the date his or her tenancy commenced. These time limits are mandatory and are therefore deemed jurisdictional. The form of the request shall be determined by the Board.

(B) Notification of Landlord. Upon receipt of the request, the Board shall notify the landlord and request the landlord to submit to the Board, within thirty (30) days of the notification, sufficient documentary evidence to substantiate the initial rent charged to the tenant.

(C) Documentary Evidence. A landlord's documentary evidence may include rent receipts, the rental agreement of the previous tenancy, or such other evidence as the Board may determine to be satisfactory by rule or regulation.

(D) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(2) The Board shall determine whether the documentary evidence submitted by the landlord is sufficient to substantiate the initial rent, or any portion thereof, charged to the tenant. The Board shall mail notice to the parties of its determination within thirty (30) days. All documentary evidence supporting the Board's determination shall be available for inspection by the parties.

(c) Request for Hearing on Determination of Initial Rent.

(1) Filing. A landlord or tenant who seeks to challenge or enforce the Board's determination rendered under Section 37.8(b) above may petition for a hearing on the initial rent. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the Board's determination. This time limit is mandatory and is therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(3) Effect of Filing. Filing a petition for verification or determination of initial rent does not relieve the tenant of his or her obligation to pay rent.

(4) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(5) Submission of Evidence; List of Witnesses. At least 72 hours prior to the hearing, both parties shall submit to the Board and to each other copies of all documentary evidence to be introduced at the hearing and a list of names and addresses of potential witnesses to be called. Failure to comply with this subsection may result in the exclusion of evidence and/or the dismissal of the petition.

(6) Hearing Record. In addition to evidence submitted at the hearing, the Board's prior determination and all documentary evidence supporting the determination shall be made part of the hearing record.

(7) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to the initial rent allowed to be charged under Section 37.3(d). If the hearing officer finds that the landlord has not substantiated the initial rent charged, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to continue to charge no more than the level of the initial rent.

(8) Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. If the hearing officer finds that the initial rent charged the tenant exceeded the allowable initial rent under Section 37.3(d), the hearing officer may either order the landlord to refund the excess to the tenant within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order said amount offset against future rent. However, that no such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the landlord.

(9) Further Procedures Applicable to Arbitration of Initial Rent Disputes. Hearings conducted pursuant to Section 37.8(c) are further subject to the general hearing procedures set forth in subsections (f)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (h)(6), and (h)(8). Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(10) Additional Remedies. The remedies available in Section 37.8(b) and (c) shall be in addition to any other remedies available to the tenant or the Board.

(11) The Board shall promulgate rules and regulations for the administrative implementation of Section 37.8(c).

(d) Request for Hearing on Fair Market Adjustment.

(1) Filing. A landlord who seeks a fair market adjustment as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)(E)(ii) above may petition for a hearing. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board no later than 240 days after the commencement of the first new tenancy beginning on or after July 1, 1991. This time limit is mandatory and therefore jurisdictional.

(3) Further Requirements. In addition to the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (2) above, the fair market adjustment hearing and procedures shall be governed by subsections (c)(3), (4), (5), and (7) above, and by subsections (f)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (h)(6) and (h)(8) below. Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(4) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether the landlord shall be permitted a fair market adjustment. If the adjustment is permitted, the hearing officer shall recalculate the establishment of the initial rent as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)
above. The adjustment shall be calculated prior to all other calculations of increases and allowances permitted under Section 37.30(a). The hearing officer may order payment to the landlord within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact of any sums owed by the tenant as a result of the recalculations, or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the tenant.

(b) (e) Procedure for Arbitration; Hearing to Adjust Rents for Tenants in Occupancy.

(1) Landlords. Landlords who seek to impose rent increases which exceed the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a) above must request an arbitration hearing as set forth in this Section. Where there has been a prior order pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(7) which limited the rent increases for a tenant because the landlord failed to substantiate the initial rent charged, the landlord may request an arbitration hearing to establish the tenant's allowable initial rent based upon evidence which was not previously available due to good cause; provided however, that this limitation does not prevent a landlord from requesting an arbitration hearing on the basis of rent increase under subsection (h) below. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Tenants.

(A) Notwithstanding Section 37.3: (a) Tenants of non-RAP rental units and tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated on or after July 1, 1977 may request arbitration hearings where a landlord has substantially decreased services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law and/or has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant. The burden of proof is on the tenant where a tenant claims one or more of the following:

(i) The landlord seeks a rent increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a).

(ii) The landlord has substantially decreased housing services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law.

(iii) The landlord has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant.

(iv) The landlord is seeking any rent increase after a hearing officer has ordered no increases pursuant to subsection (e)(7) above.

(B) Tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated prior to July 1, 1977 may petition for a hearing where the landlord has noticed an increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.27 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. After a vacancy has occurred in a RAP rental unit in said areas, a new tenant of said unit may petition for a hearing where the landlord has demanded and/or received a rent for that unit which exceeds the rent increase limitation set forth in Section 37.27 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(e) (g) Procedure for Tenant Petitioners.

(1) Filing; Limitation. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and shall be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, justification for the proposed increase or substantiation of the initial rent charged where new evidence has become available as provided in Section 37.8(e)(1) above. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Filing Date. The petition must be filed prior to the mailing or delivering to the tenant or tenants legal notice of the rent increase exceeding the limitations as defined in Section 37.3.

(3) Effect of Timely Filing of Petition. Provided a completed petition is timely filed, that portion of the requested rent increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 has not been certified as a justifiable increase in accordance with Section 37.7 is inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the arbitration hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(e) (g) Procedure for Tenant Petitioners.

(1) Filing; Limitation. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and must be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, a copy of the landlord's notice of rent increase. If the tenant petitioner has received certification findings regarding his rental unit in accordance with Section 37.7, such findings must accompany the petition. If the tenant petitioner has received a notification from the Chief Administrative Officer with respect to base rent and amortization of a RAP loan, such notification must accompany the petition. Tenant petitions regarding the gas and electricity pass-through must be filed within one year of the effective date of the pass-through or within one year of the date the pass-through was required to be recalculated pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated by the Board. This time limit is mandatory and therefore deemed jurisdictional. The burden of proof is on the tenant.

(2) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. Responses to a petition for hearing may be submitted in writing.

(e) (h) Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing must be held within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the petition. The level of housing services provided to tenants' rental units shall not be decreased during the period between the filing of the petition and the conclusion of the hearing.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer: Rental Units. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the landlord's proposed rental increase exceeding the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 is justifiable or whether or not the landlord has effected a rent increase through a reduction in services or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance as required by state or local law or whether that landlord is receiving a fair rate of return. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the following factors:

(A) Increases or decreases in operating and maintenance expenses, including, but not limited to, real estate taxes, sewer service charges, janitorial service, refuse removal, elevator service, security system, and debt service; provided however, when a unit is purchased after the effective date of this ordinance, and this purchase occurs within two (2) years of the date of the previous purchase, consideration shall not be given to that portion of increased debt service which has resulted from a selling price which exceeds the seller's purchase price by more than the percentage increase in the "Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Labor" between the date of previous purchase and the date of the current sale, plus the cost of capital improvements or rehabilitation work made or performed by the seller.

(B) The past history of increases in the rent for the unit and the comparison of the rent for the unit with rents for comparable units in the same general area.

(C) Any findings which have been made pursuant to Section 37.7 with respect to the unit.

(D) Failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement and maintenance in compliance with applicable state and local law.

(E) Prior orders limiting increases pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(7) where the landlord has failed to substantiate the initial rent charged.

(F) The landlord's rate of return.

(G) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in rules and regulations.

(5) Determination of the Hearing Officer: RAP Rental Units.

A) RAP Rental units in RAP areas designated prior to July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the noticed or proposed rental increase exceeds the rent increase limitations set forth in Section 37.27 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall apply the rent increase limitations set forth in
Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and all rules and regulations promulgated therein. The hearing officer shall consider the evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(3) RAP rental units in RAP areas designated on or after July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings with respect to rent increases exceeding the limitations as set forth in Section 37.3 of this Chapter. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the factors set forth in subsection (4) above and shall consider evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(6) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed to the parties within 30 days of the hearing.

(7) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. Upon finding that all or any portion of the rent increase is or is not justified, the hearing officer may order payment or refund of all or a portion of such cumulative amount within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party.

(8) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his decision on appeal.

(6) Appeals.

(1) Time and Manner. Any appeal to the Board from the determination of the hearing officer must be made within fifteen (15) calendar days of the mailing of the findings of fact unless such time limit is extended by the Board upon a showing of good cause. The appeal shall be in writing and must state why appellant believes there was either error or abuse of discretion on the part of the hearing officer. The filing of an appeal will stay only that portion of any hearing officer's decision which permits payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent.

(2) Record on Appeal. Upon receipt of an appeal, the entire administrative record of the matter, including the appeal, shall be filed with the Board.

(3) Appeals. The Board shall, in its discretion, hear appeals. In deciding whether or not to hear a given appeal, the Board shall consider, among other factors, fairness to the parties, hardship to either party, and promoting the policies and purposes of this Chapter, in addition to any written comments submitted by the hearing officer whose decision is being challenged. The Board may also review other material from the administrative record of the matter as it deems necessary. A vote of three (3) members shall be required in order for an appeal to be heard.

(4) Remand to Hearing Officer without Appeal Hearing. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer has erred, the Board may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its instructions without conducting an appeal hearing. Both parties shall be notified as to the time of the re-hearing, which shall be conducted within thirty (30) days of remanding by the Board. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer's findings contain numerical or clerical inaccuracies, or require clarification, the Board may continue the hearing for purposes of re-referring the case to the hearing officer in order to correct the findings.

(5) Time of Appeal Hearing; Notice to Parties. Appeals accepted by the Board shall be heard within forty-five (45) days of the filing of an appeal. Within thirty (30) days of the filing of an appeal, both parties shall be notified in writing as to whether or not the appeal has been accepted. If the appeal has been accepted, the notice shall state the time of the hearing and the nature of the hearing. Such notice must be mailed at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(6) Appeal Hearing; Decision of the Board. At the appeal hearing, both appellant and respondent shall have an opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents in support of their positions. After such hearing and after any further investigation which the Board may deem necessary the Board may, upon hearing the appeal, affirm, reverse or modify the hearing officer's decision or may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its findings. The Board's decision must be rendered within forty-five (45) days of the hearing and the parties must be notified of such decision.

(7) Notification of the Parties. In accordance with item (6) above, parties shall receive written notice of the decision. The notice shall state that this decision is final.

(8) Effective Date of Appeal Decisions. Appeal decisions are effective on the date mailed to the parties; provided, however, that that portion of any decision which orders payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent shall become effective thirty (30) calendar days after it is mailed to the parties unless a stay of execution is granted by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Limitation of Actions. A landlord or tenant aggrieved by any decision of the Board must seek judicial review within ninety (90) calendar days of the date of mailing of the decision. Sec. 37.10A. Misdemeanors.

It shall be unlawful for a landlord to increase rent or rents in violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal pursuant to the hearing and appeal procedures set forth in Section 37.8 of this Chapter. It shall further be unlawful for a landlord to charge an initial rent or any subsequent rent which exceeds the limitations of this Chapter. Any person who increases rents in violation of such decisions or who charges excessive initial rents or excessive subsequent rents shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor hereunder shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $2,000.00 or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six (6) months, or by both. Each violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal as set forth above shall constitute a separate offense. Sec. 37.11A. Civil Actions.

Whenever a landlord fails to comply with the rent disclosure requirements of Section 37.3(e), charges a tenant a rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in this Chapter, or retaliates against a tenant for the exercise of any rights under this Chapter, the tenant may institute a civil proceeding for money damages. A tenant who has been charged an initial rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(d) may, upon prevailing, recover money damages of up to three times actual damages and any other relief the court deems appropriate. The prevailing party in any civil action brought under this Section shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The remedy available under this Section shall be in addition to any other existing remedies which may be available to the tenant.
PROPOSITION N

Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under City law, only certain types of buildings may be converted to condominiums. 40% of the building's tenants must state an intent to buy their units. Conversions are limited to 200 units each year.

Current law gives tenants the first chance to buy the unit and the right to continue to rent for a year if they do not buy. Senior citizens or disabled tenants who do not buy may continue to rent as long as they want, unless lawfully evicted.

Current condominium conversion laws also contain a number of other conditions: The building owner must pay the moving expenses of non-purchasing tenants and must show that the building complies with City codes. The building owner must not have a history of discrimination or illegal evictions. If the 200 unit limit on conversions is changed, the law requires that units classified as low and moderate income rental units be sold at prices affordable to low and moderate income buyers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is an ordinance that would create an additional way to convert rental units to condominiums. There would be no limit on the number of units that could be converted each year under Proposition N or on the types of buildings converted.

Proposition N conversions would be allowed if certain conditions are met: (1) at least 80% of the building is occupied; (2) written notice is given to tenants, explaining their rights under this law; (3) at least 51% of the tenants give written approval; (4) tenants are given first chance to buy their units at a price no greater than 75% of the unit's value; (5) tenants are offered financing for at least 90% of the unit's price.

All tenants who do not buy could continue to rent as long as they wanted unless lawfully evicted.

It is unclear whether some sections of current law would apply to Proposition N conversions. These include sections on: moving expenses, tenants' statements of intent to buy, code compliance, low and moderate income housing, past illegal evictions and discrimination.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

If the proposed Ordinance is approved, in my opinion, it would increase the total property tax revenues of the City and County by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. Additionally, certain permit and inspection services which are presently paid by filing fees for service might increase by an indeterminable amount.

The amount of the potential increase in revenue would depend upon the number of properties converted under provisions in the Ordinance and their respective assessed valuations.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On August 9, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bill Maher, Jim Gonzalez, Willie B. Kennedy and Tom Hsieh. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
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PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Renters' Choice. The choice to buy a home is part of the American Dream that should not be denied to any San Franciscan. Proposition N allows renters to become home-owners if the landlord and the tenants agree, while protecting tenants who choose to rent, and improving our neighborhoods.

Proposition N is the opportunity for a better San Francisco.

RENTERS WILL BENEFIT

Over the years, monthly rent adds up to a lot of money. Many City residents do not have the large down payment it takes to buy a home in today's market, and find themselves trapped in this expensive renting cycle. Home ownership provides financial security and stability.

With Proposition N, renters will have the opportunity to purchase their apartments from the owner at 75 percent of market value (determined by an independent appraiser), with no more than a 10 percent down payment. The owner will arrange for the financing. Fifty percent of the building's renters must agree to purchase, and residents who choose to rent are protected by rent control laws for the rest of their lives.

Proposition N is by and for the renters of San Francisco.

OUR CITY WILL BENEFIT

As renters become home owners, the sales transactions will generate property tax revenue for San Francisco. Proposition N will increase revenue to support important City services such as health care, MUNI, police and fire protection, and will improve our quality of life at no cost to the general public.

Proposition N is a good deal on both sides of the handshake.

Vote Yes for Renter's Choice.

Vote Yes for new home ownership opportunities in San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

John Eaton
President, Renters for Home Ownership

Nicole Sunahara
Vice-President, Renters for Home Ownership

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

There is a major eviction loophole in this Initiative. Because of recently enacted State law, the lifetime leases the proponents guarantee are not solely a matter of local control and cannot be relied upon.

Who would argue with the idea of tenants "owning" their own homes? All of us support home ownership. But in a city where the average price for a condominium is over $250,000, affordability is a critical concern.

The new system proposed by Proposition N was actually tried in San Francisco over 10 years ago.

All of the benefits touted by the sponsors of Proposition N were part of that system.

How did it work out?

89% of all the tenants in buildings that were converted did not become homeowners.

Only 11% of the people who signed intents to purchase actually bought their homes.

That's why San Francisco adopted an ordinance limiting the number of rental units converted to condominiums to 200 annually. Proposition N would abolish this limit.

It will benefit a handful of people who might purchase their units at $150,000 - $200,000 and then turn around and sell their units at $200,000 - $265,000. This is one of the serious flaws in Proposition N.

Nothing in Proposition N guarantees real, long-term affordability. Proposition N is bad public policy. I urge you to vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

This is a Reagan-like de-regulation of a system that works just fine. Proposition N would deregulate the condominium conversion process. Condo developers would be allowed to convert an unlimited number of apartments to more expensive condominiums.

The City’s current law allows up to 200 rental units per year to be converted to condominiums. Enacted in 1982, it represented a compromise between “free market” advocates who were willing to accept the loss of 500 – 1000+ rental units a year and housing/community advocates seeking to ban conversions altogether. That compromise has worked.

Proposition N sets up a second, brand-new conversion process that allows an unlimited number of conversions. It’s effectively a repeal of the current annual limit.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned a study of condo conversions that took place before we had a limit: 89% of the tenants in converted buildings were displaced by conversion. They did not become homeowners.

Finally, the much touted tenant protections and affordability provisions of Proposition N are either the same or similar to current City law, or in some cases, significantly weaker.

Unlimited condo conversions are a bad deal for San Francisco. Vote no on Proposition N.

Mayor Art Agnos

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Mayor Agnos, you are fortunate enough to own your own home. All we renters want is the same choice you had when you became part of the American Dream of home ownership.

You’re wrong when you say that the present system works “just fine.”

The City’s current system is faulty because it is landlord driven. Under the “annual limit” law you support, renters are being displaced, which is nothing to brag about.

PROPOSITION N IS TENANT DRIVEN — IT GUARANTEES THAT NO TENANT CAN BE DISPLACED.

All San Franciscans should have the opportunity to become a home owner. The argument for an “annual limit” in the number of renters buying a home translates shamefully into “I’ve got mine.”

FOR EVERY APARTMENT THAT IS PURCHASED, RENTERS BECOME HOMEOWNERS. PROPOSITION N MEETS THE NEED FOR HOME OWNERSHIP.

Current City laws do not provide sufficient protections or affordability safeguards for renters. PROPOSITION N ALLOWS RENTERS TO BENEFIT FROM A DISCOUNT OF 25% OFF EACH UNIT AND LOW DOWN PAYMENTS.

Proposition N will generate desperately needed revenue for important City services. HOME OWNERSHIP BUILDS STRONGER COMMUNITIES AND CIVIC PRIDE.

We speak as the renters of San Francisco — 70% of the City’s population. We want opportunities for affordable home ownership. We are young couples, families, single-income renters. We are hard-working San Franciscans...we are not politicians. When the majority of the residents here cannot afford to buy a home, the system is not working.

John Eaton
Nicole Sunahara
Renters for Home Ownership
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Yes on Proposition N. Vote for affordable homeownership. Proposition N is a win-win proposition. It allows tenants in buildings where a majority of renters wish to buy, to become homeowners. It protects those who do not wish to buy with lifetime leases. Proposition N results in new revenue for city services.

Protect tenants — provide homeownership opportunities — fund important city services.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Homeownership is the American ideal. Recent polls show more than 80% of San Franciscans want to own their own home.

Proposition N, The Home Ownership Initiative, is the first real attempt in twenty years to create significant new affordable home ownership opportunities in San Francisco.

Proposition N will allow that. For years our city’s policies have been anti-home ownership. City Hall has taken the cavalier attitude that if you’re middle class and want to own a home, you will just have to leave town. We have adopted policy after policy preventing meaningful affordable home ownership opportunities. Proposition N allows renters to buy their homes at affordable prices.

Proposition N requires that a majority of the tenants agree in writing to the choice of purchasing their own units.

Proposition N requires that if the landlord decides to sell, he must offer tenants their units at no more than 75% of their market value and at 90% financing -- a huge savings to tenants.

Proposition N guarantees long term leases for any tenants who choose not to purchase. Those who choose to continue renting are protected for life.

It has been suggested that this will reduce rentals in the City. Is it far better to allow people to own their own homes than to force them to rent forever or else leave town? Shouldn’t we be proud to have a goal of a City where the majority of its residents own their homes? Proposition N will triple the number of San Franciscans who can own their own homes while protecting its renters.

Not one person will be evicted because of Proposition N. Please join me and many thousands of San Franciscans in making affordable home ownership a reality.

Vote yes on Proposition N.

Supervisor Bill Maher

As an architect, and Member of the Board of Supervisors, I have been involved in creating affordable housing for San Franciscans for decades.

Proposition N is creative and fair housing legislation that will keep our City livable and economically sound.

Proposition N will allow average income San Franciscans in an apartment building to democratically and economically purchase individual apartments from their landlord. Renters who choose not to buy get lifetime leases.

Existing laws already protect low income rental units from being affected by this new law — so, Proposition N works for the common good of all San Franciscans.

Proposition N is good public policy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The way things are now in our City, working people, paying rent in very expensive apartments for years and years end up with nothing to show for it.

Many are forced to move to distant suburbs and towns to find home ownership opportunities.

It’s time to be creative and provide NEW opportunities for first-time home buyers. Proposition N allows folks to buy their units at a discount, low down payment, and landlords have to help finance the purchase.

Renters that do not choose to buy get lifetime leases.

Proposition N will help middle income San Franciscans achieve the American Dream.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

After being a renter here in San Francisco for over ten years, this opportunity to become a home owner seems like the light at the end of the tunnel. Prop N would give us a choice to either buy or continue renting and the fact that nobody can be displaced is very comforting to everyone concerned.

Give us all the unique chance to make our own decisions to either become home owners or remain as renters by voting Yes on N.

Hedwig Montalvo

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a win-win proposal for renters and the City. Homeownership creates more involved and dedicated San Franciscans who will participate in the progress of our community. Homeownership increases the City’s tax base which provides more funds for public amenities and human services.

Proposition N creates new opportunities for homeownership while strictly protecting the City’s affordable housing stock.

Proposition N provides lifetime leases for renters that do not buy their units.

What could be more fair? Vote Yes on Prop. N.

Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

As a San Francisco small business owner for over 35 years, I have witnessed first hand how home ownership builds strong neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, the price of a home has risen so much that most renters have no hope of owning their own home in the City. So, these renters choose the only option open to them: they leave the City, and buy in the suburbs.

I support Proposition N because I want to create real, new home ownership opportunities for first-time San Francisco home buyers.

It’s time we stop driving the middle class out of San Francisco. Please join me in giving renters the choices they need to buy homes in San Francisco. Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Mike Salerno

While you can pick up the newspaper and find hundreds of rentals in all price ranges, it is impossible to find a house or condominium that is affordable to the average person in this City. This is more than a crisis, it is a disgrace.

Prop N is about our lives and the lives of thousands of renters who dream of becoming home owners, without having to move out of San Francisco. Prop N is a winning proposition for the renter and for the City of San Francisco. Vote YES on N!

George Polley

Under the Renter’s Choice Initiative, Proposition N, renters can purchase the apartments they live in when the owner and more than one-half of the current tenants in the building agree to a conversion.

The proposition will have significant financial benefits to the renter/homeowner, the City’s fiscal health and to the City’s economy in general, including:

A. BENEFITS TO TENANT/HOMEOwner

1. Reduction in income taxes due to the deduction of mortgage interest and real property taxes.

2. Reduction in periodic payroll withholding tax due to a reduction of income taxes.

3. The tenant/homeowner can fix his housing expense and may have greater spendable income which may increase with time by obtaining a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

B. BENEFITS TO CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1. Increased transfer tax revenue due to the purchase of apartment units by the tenant.

2. Increased property tax revenue due to the higher real property valuation resulting from individual ownership of apartment units.

3. Increased sales and use tax revenue as a result of consumption by new homeowners who may have more after-tax spendable income.

4. Help balance the City’s budget by increasing tax revenues to the City.

C. SAN FRANCISCO’S ECONOMY AND BUSINESS CLIMATE

When more people become homeowners in the City, the homeowners’ long-term financial stability is enhanced. They also have major tax deductions which they would not have as renters. These factors may translate into more spendable after tax income which strengthens the local economy and encourages investment.

Bruce A. Miller
Kenneth Leventhal & Company
Certified Public Accountants

While well-off homeowners are able to build up equity, enjoy mortgage payments that don’t increase every year (as rent does!), and savor the satisfaction of owning their own homes, tenants have none of these opportunities.

Help to reverse this trend by allowing everybody to buy a home and keep San Franciscans here who would otherwise be forced to move out. Vote Yes on Prop N.

Ivan Kinkenson

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

It would be a tragedy if San Francisco were to let itself go the way of too many other large cities in which home ownership is only the right of the extremely rich and the subsidized poor. It is the middle-income workers like myself and my neighbors who pay the taxes that support subsidized housing and who underwrite the lives of the wealthy. As middle-income residents leave for the suburbs in search of the homes they are denied here, the city suffers — in a loss of diversity, a loss of tax revenue, and a loss of will, frankly. This town will become like too many others, a city of extreme wealth and extreme poverty — with no one left to foot the bill. Vote Yes on N.

John George Bilotta

Home ownership is a prime opportunity that many San Francisco citizens cannot achieve without Prop N. This legislation is fair, honest and provides numerous safeguards to protect renters. Taxes generated by home sales will create funds for the City’s health, fire and police protection. Prop N is a good deal for San Francisco. Please vote yes on Prop N.

Stanley DeSouza

I urge you to vote in favor of Prop N, thus giving the opportunity of home ownership to many people who will otherwise be forced to eventually buy homes out of the City and commute in and out of town to their workplace. I’ve rented in the same apartment complex for over 14 years and welcome this opportunity. Vote Yes on N!

Gladys Mersersmith

Rent increases, unreasonable landlords, poor maintenance . . . I hate being a renter! Without Proposition N, I would never have the opportunity to own my home in San Francisco. I urge every voter who has paid enough in monthly rent to buy their apartments ten times over, but can’t come up with the hefty down payment needed to buy a home, to vote YES on N.

Kris Matsuyama

THANK YOU Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh, Kennedy, and Mather for standing up for the “underdog” renters. It’s about time that City Hall started thinking about practical legislation to deal with the problem of affordable housing for the people who live and work in San Francisco.

Erika K. Pringsheim

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Allowing more apartments to become condominiums reduces rental housing, driving up rents for 70% of San Franciscans unable to purchase a home. Protect rental housing. Vote No on N!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Prop N will deplete the number of rent-controlled apartments by allowing more units to “go condo” each year. We say: Look for ways to build new housing, but don’t take away the few affordable units we have!

Vote NO on N!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
St. Peter’s Housing Committee

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

Proposition N’s “eviction protections” don’t kick in until after the building is converted to condominiums, when it’s too late. The developers will get rid of tenants who don’t “cooperate” and rent to only upscale tenants who can afford to buy expensive condos and then convert. That’s what they used to do and they will do it again under Prop. N.

Proposition N is merely a loophole in the condo conversion law designed to help landlords and developers make a quick profit. All the real renters organizations oppose this fraud.

No on N!

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Community Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition

We’ve all been victims of the phony “sale” price. You know, the kind where you think you got a great deal. Then you find out that first they inflated the regular price, then they gave you the “discount”. You still end up paying way too much.

That’s how Prop N works. First they double or triple the value of the apartment by converting it to a condo. Then they offer the “discount” on the inflated price! Then they “offer” you financing with a big balloon payment in five years! Thanks, but no thanks.

Don’t be a victim of a phoney fast-talking sales pitch. Vote no on N.

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Tenants Union

They promise lifetime leases to tenants who don’t buy. But they forgot about State law. When those condominiums are sold, the new owners will use Gov. Code Sec. 7060 et Seq. to remove their condo from rental use, evicting the tenants with “lifetime” leases. And it’s all perfectly legal because State law overrides City law. Completely unlimited condo conversions, loss of affordable apartments, useless “lifetime” leases? Say no to “N”.

Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Terence Hallinan

You don’t have to go far to see why Proposition N won’t work. For four years San Francisco operated under a law that was virtually identical to Prop. N. Most of its provisions — including the tenants’ “agreement” to conversion and protections for tenants who don’t buy — were adopted in 1979 and are still on the books.

Unfortunately, without a reasonable annual limit on conversions, the law just doesn’t work.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned the only comprehensive study of condominium conversions ever done in San Francisco.

The startling conclusion: 89% of the original tenants in converted buildings were evicted or otherwise displaced by the conversion, despite all the Prop. N style protections.

Prop. N means unlimited conversions. Don’t turn the clock back ten years or more. Vote No on N.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

Proposition N is what gives SOME landlords and SOME supervisors a bad name. San Francisco’s condominium conversion law is a Board of Supervisors ordinance, not enacted by initiative. Proposition N, however, is an initiative propounded by ONLY 4 members of the Board of Supervisors (Hsieh, Maher, Kennedy, Gonzalez) and not even by the number of registered voters' signatures required to qualify an initiative by petition. If enacted, Proposition N will be inflexible and impervious to change except by another costly ballot measure. Proposition N shouldn’t be on the ballot; it’s bad government, wrought by the ultimate selfish special interest, and the San Francisco Taxpayers Association strongly urges its rejection.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp
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Don't be fooled by the condominium developers. San Francisco already has a law that:

- Prevents conversions in buildings where there have been any evictions for the purposes of converting in the 18 months before the conversion (not just after the conversion when its too late like Prop. N)
- Guarantees senior citizens and permanently disabled tenants life-time leases
- Guarantees rents for those who remain in the building are covered by rent control

What are the condominium developers up to?
Proposition N would effectively repeal the current limit of 200 conversions a year and allow a completely unlimited number effective immediately!

The results of Mayor Feinstein's Condominium conversion study are clear: Proposition N will result in 89% of the tenants in the buildings being converted being moved out.

Don't be fooled by phoney discounts on inflated prices. We urge you to vote no on Prop. N.

Assemblyman John Burton

Another Bad idea from four politicians looking for easy campaign contributions. Don’t let the real estate industry hijack our city to the land of condomania. Vote No on N.

David C. Spero

Proposition N is the most blatant example of a greedy special interest measure on this year's municipal election ballot. It represents the epitome of stealthy manipulation of Board of Supervisor members to accommodate CERTAIN landlords. Moreover, its very provisions were invalidly revised AFTER it was submitted to the Registrar of Voters by a wealthy property owner. I’m voting NO on it and urge other voters to do the same.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

The San Francisco Democratic Party urges you to vote NO on Proposition N.
Many San Franciscans cannot afford to buy a home. The effect of this proposition is to shrink the availability of rental housing and force San Francisco rental and home ownership costs even higher.
The average home in San Francisco sells for over $350,000. This proposition would require a prospective homebuyer to provide a $35,000 down payment, far more than most San Franciscans can afford.

Say no to the “Realtors Profit” proposition. Vote NO on Proposition N.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O'Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudes, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Catherine J. Dodd RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

RENTER'S CHOICE MEASURE: HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XIII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (SUBDIVISION CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 1396 THEREOF TO CREATE HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES BY CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS AND ADDING SECTION 1396B THERETO TO EXEMPT FROM THE CONVERSION LIMITATIONS OF SECTION 1396 THE CONVERSION OF APARTMENT UNITS IN ANY APARTMENT BUILDINGS WHERE MORE THAN HALF OF THE TENANTS AGREE TO THE CONVERSION, MAKING FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE EXEMPTION, AND AMENDING CHAPTER 37 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 37 OF THEREOF TO PROVIDE THAT LANDLORDS MAY NOT EVICT TENANTS FROM UNITS CONVERTED TO CONDOMINIUMS UNDER SUBDIVISION CODE SECTION 1396B ON THE GROUND THAT THE LANDLORD OR A RELATIVE DESIRES TO OCCUPY THE UNIT.

Section 1. Findings.

In the 1980's, there was a dramatic inflation in real estate prices in San Francisco. During this decade, the increase in median home price far exceeded the increased in the median household income for the City. This widening gap between home prices and incomes has placed the benefits of home ownership beyond the reach of a majority of San Francisco households. The inflation in real estate prices has virtually excluded first time home buyers from the housing market and has made it extremely difficult for expanding families who have recently purchased a home to trade up to a larger home more suitable to the needs of a large family.

The City should expand the opportunities for owner-occupancy of housing and develop efficient programs to facilitate home ownership for households of varied income levels. The conversion of rental apartments to condominiums is a potential source of affordable owner-occupied housing. However, condominium conversions must balance the need for home ownership against the goal of avoiding displacement of tenants.

These amendments balance such goals by providing affordable home ownership opportunities through regulations which will allow the sale of residential units at below-market prices with low down payments, and will not displace tenants who do not elect to purchase their units. The program will also provide financial and other benefits to the City by creating stable long-term residents, increasing the City’s real estate tax base and providing additional revenue from transfer taxes.

Under these regulations, complete applications for conversion of apartment buildings will be accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis. Buildings will be eligible for conversion when, among other things:

(a) 80% of the residential units in the building are occupied at the time of filing the application and not less than 51% of the tenants have approved in writing of the conversion.

(b) The subdivider shall have obtained and furnished to each tenant a copy of an independent appraisal of the market value of each unit.

(c) No tenant shall be evicted or involuntarily relocated because of the sale of units, and any tenant who does not elect to purchase his or her unit may be extended a life time lease with full rights and privileges under the City's rent control ordinances. In addition the proposed regulations specify that upon the death of an elderly non-purchasing tenant, the unit may be leased by the other's spouse or domestic partner of the deceased with the same privileges.

(d) The cost associated with conversion or code compliance may not be passed on to the tenants or purchasers of the units.

(e) Within a year of issuance of the Department of Real Estate public report tenants will be offered the right to purchase their unit for not more than 75% of the fair market value (as determined by current appraisal) as of the date of filing the application.

(f) To each tenant's purchase of the unit, the subdivider shall cause to be offered to the tenant financing in an amount, as elected by the tenant, of at least 90% of the purchase price. At least 90% of the principal amount of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of 25 years and the balance of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of five years. The fixed or variable interest rate, loan fees and closing costs on all such financing shall be no higher than that offered by the Bank of America for a 25 year fixed or variable home mortgage in equivalent amount.

(g) Tenants who purchase their units must represent in writing that such units will be used a residence for not less than 12 months; and

(h) No landlord may evict the tenant because of the landlord's desire to occupy or have a relative occupy the tenants unit.

... 

Section 2; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by adding Section 1396B thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 1396. ANNUAL CONVERSION LIMITATION. This section governing annual limitation shall apply only to conversion of residential units.

Subject to the provisions of Section 1396B, applications for conversions of residential units, whether vacant or occupied, shall not be accepted by the Department of Public Works during the period of January 1, 1990 – December 31, 1993, inclusive, except that a maximum of 200 units, as selected yearly by lottery by the Department of Public Works from all eligible applicants, may be approved for conversion per year during the aforementioned period for the following categories of buildings:

(a) Buildings consisting of four units or less in which one of the units has been occupied continuously by one of the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(b) Buildings consisting of six units or less in which 50 percent or more of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(c) Community apartments as defined in Section 1308 of this Code, which, on or before December 31, 1982, met the criteria for community apartments in Section 1308 of this Code and which were approved as a subdivision by the Department of Public Works on or before December 31, 1982, and where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

The conversion of a stock cooperative as defined in Section 1308 of this Code to condominiums shall be exempt from the annual limitation imposed on the number if conversions in this Section and from the requirement to be selected by lottery where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

No application for conversions of a residential building submitted by a registrant shall be approved by the Department of Public Works to fill the unused portion of the 200 unit annual limitation for the previous year.

The provision of this Section shall become operative on January 1, 1990.

Section 3; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by adding Section 1396B thereto, to read as follows:

Sec. 1396B. CONVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS WITH APPROVAL OF MAJORITY OF TENANTS — NO EVICTIONS.

(a) Notwithstanding Section 1396 of this Code, from and after the effective date of this Section, the Department of Public Works shall accept on a first-come, first-served basis (as hereinafter set forth) completed applications for conversion to condominiums of residential apartments, where no less than 80% of the residential units in such buildings are occupied at the time of the filing of the application. Buildings converted under this Section must meet the conditions of the following Subsections (b) through (g). For purposes of this Section, a “building” shall include an apart-

(Continued on next page)
ment complex under a single ownership or approved as a single development. Applications for conversion under this Section shall be approved on a first-come, first-served basis among applicants who have submitted complete applications, which applications shall be deemed complete when the conditions of the following subsections (b) through (g) have been met. The Department of Public Works shall approve a completed application which complies with all the provisions hereof within thirty months of filing of such application or such application shall be deemed approved.

(b) The subdivider shall (I) give written notice of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants provided in this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (II) provide to the tenant an appraisal of the fair market value of the subdivider's unit as of a date not more than 90 days prior to the filing of a complete application. The fair market value shall be determined by an independent appraisal by a licensed Member of the American Appraisal Institute paid for by the subdivider.

(c) Within five days of filing an application for a Tentative Map with the Department of Public Works for conversion of a building under this Section, (I) the subdivider shall give written notice (by certified or registered mail or by certified, return receipt requested) of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants provided in this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (II) the proposed conversion shall be approved in writing by not less than 51 percent of the tenants of the building. The provisions of Section 1388 of this code shall also apply to conversions under this Section.

(d) No tenant on the date of filing of the application or, in the event of a voluntary vacation or eviction for cause, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report, shall be evicted or involuntarily relocated as a result of a conversion under this Section. The lease of any tenant who does not elect to purchase his or her unit shall be extended until the death of such tenant or until the tenant vacates the unit, either voluntarily or as the result of a lawful eviction. A non-purchasing tenant who elects to remain in his or her unit shall be subject to the same rights and privileges as are applicable under any lease to the unit until the expiration of such lease and thereafter under Administrative Code Chapter 37. The provisions of Section 1391 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section. None of the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures required under the City's Housing, Building, or City Planning Codes for the filing of a Final Map may be passed through to the tenants in the form of a rent increase under Administrative Code Section 37.7. Upon the death of any non-purchasing tenant aged 62 or older occupying a unit converted to a condominium under this Section, any surviving spouse or domestic partner (as defined in the San Francisco Municipal Code) who was a member of such tenant's household within one month prior to the death of the tenant shall be entitled to all the rights of a tenant in such unit under this Section and under Administrative Code Chapter 37.

(e) Within one year of the issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report for any building converted to condominiums under this Section, the subdivider shall offer in writing to each tenant at the date of filing of the application or, in the event such tenant voluntarily vacates or is evicted for cause before the issuance of the Public Report, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the Public Report) a nontransferable right to purchase the unit occupied by such tenant. The price offered by the Subdivider for such unit shall be no more than 75 percent of the fair market value of such unit as of the date of filing of the application. Such offer may not be extended by the Subdivider to the tenant before the recordation of the Final Map or Parcel Map and the issuance of the Public Report. Such right to purchase shall extend for 90 days from the date the subdivider first offers the unit to the tenant. The period for acceptance of the offer may be extended by an agreement in writing between the subdivider and tenant. The tenant may cancel this agreement to offer or to purchase the unit if it is not conveyed to the tenant within six months of a written agreement to purchase the unit. The provisions of Section 1387 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section.

(f) To finance the purchase by each tenant of the unit occupied, the subdivider shall cause to be offered financing to be provided to each tenant from either a conventional lending institution or purchase money financing from the subdivider in an amount, at the election of the tenant, of at least 90 percent of the purchase price for the unit. Such financing shall be secured by one or more deeds of trust on the unit. Ninety percent of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of 20 years, and the balance of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of five years. All such financing shall be subject to a fixed or variable rate of interest, loan fee, and closing costs no higher than the rates offered by the Bank of America for a 25-year fixed or variable home mortgage for a loan of an amount equivalent to the amount to be financed at the time the tenant accepts the subdivider's offer. Tenants shall not be required to accept such financing as a condition of purchase.

(g) Before the transfer of title to any unit converted under this Section, the subdivider shall submit to the City's Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Surveys and Mapping Division, the following for each unit:

(1) Copies of the notices of the proposed conversion given in accordance with Subsections (b) and (c) and a representation under penalty of perjury that the notices were timely provided to the tenant occupying the unit;

(2) A copy of the subdivider's offer to sell the unit to the tenant in accordance with Subsection (e), including a statement of the price and the terms of financing offered to the tenant;

(3) A copy of the appraisal of the unit;

(4) With respect to units whose tenants elect not to purchase, the subdivider's certification (sworn under penalty of perjury) and return receipt for the notice described in Subsection (b) above, evidencing that each such tenant has been informed in writing of their rights under this Section, including the rights to purchase the unit at 75 percent of its fair market value and to receive financing arranged by the subdivider on the terms set forth in Subsections (e) and (f);

(5) With respect to units whose tenants elect to purchase, a letter from the tenant stating the sale price of the unit, the amount of the down payment, the terms of the financing, and a representation under penalty of perjury that such unit will be used as the principal residence of such tenant for a period of not less than twelve months following the date of transfer of title.

(6) Such information as are required under Section 1381 of this Code.

Section 4. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Section 37.9(a)(8) and 37.9(a) thereof, to read as follows:

Sec. 37.9. Evictions. Notwithstanding Section 37.3, this Section shall apply as of August 24, 1980, to all landlords and tenants of rental units as defined in Section 37.2(o). A landlord shall not endeavor to recover possession of a rental unit unless:

(8) (A) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit on or before the thirtieth day after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without ulterior reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use of or occupancy as his or her own principal residence, or for the use as occupancy as the principal residence of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, or the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 10 percent interest in the property. A landlord may not recover possession under this subsection if a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It (Continued on next page)
shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or

(B) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit more than 30 days after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without ulterior reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use or occupancy as his or her principal resident of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, of the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 25 percent interest on the property. A landlord may not recover possession under the subsection if a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy. If a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy. If comparable unit does become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B, it being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of desire to occupy such unit by landlord or landlord's relative; or

(9) The landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith in order to sell the unit in accordance with a condominium conversion approved under the San Francisco subdivision ordinance and does so without ulterior reasons and with honest intent. This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B; it being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of landlord's desire to sell the unit or to have the unit occupied by another person.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We the people of the City and County of San Francisco reaffirm our unqualified support for the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States which reads:
"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

We hold that these provisions, particularly as they relate to freedom of expression, are absolute and without exception. We oppose any and all efforts of government, at any level, to regulate or restrict the content of the print, broadcast, and electronic media; the visual and performing arts; music; or any other form of speech. We call upon the State of California and the Government of the United States to cease and desist all acts of censorship. We also call upon the City and County of San Francisco to cease and desist all efforts to restrict freedom of expression and ask that no city funds be used in a manner contrary to the spirit of this initiative.

We ordain that the community standards of the City and County of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance, and the rejection of every form of censorship.

NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?
Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.
First Amendment

PROPOSITION O

Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City's unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression? YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Freedom of expression is protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and by the California Constitution.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to affirm San Francisco's unqualified support of the First Amendment. The measure says that the people of San Francisco oppose all government efforts to regulate or restrict any form of expression. Proposition O calls on the federal, state and City governments to stop all efforts to restrict freedom of expression. The measure asks that no City funds be used contrary to the spirit of this measure.

The measure states that the community standards of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance and the rejection of every form of censorship.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this policy about freedom of expression.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "O"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How "O" Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 valid signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 22, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,500 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,101 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION O IS ON PAGE 140.
PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

Our nation’s Founders wisely wrote a Constitution to limit government power. Just in case they hadn’t made it clear enough that government powers must be strictly limited, they added a Bill of Rights specifically forbidding government from infringing on certain important liberties.

The First Amendment protects freedom of speech and the press. The Founders made clear that the Constitution forbade government from infringing on any speech or publication. James Madison, considered the Father of the Constitution wrote, “Is then the federal government destitute of every authority for restraining the licentiousness of the press? . . . the answer must be, that the federal government is destitute of all such authority.” George Hay, a U.S. District Attorney, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and later a Federal Judge, in 1799 said, “If the words ‘freedom of the press’ have any meaning at all they mean a total exemption from any law making any publication whatever criminal.”

Thomas Jefferson wrote, “No definite line can be drawn between the inestimable liberty of the press and its demoralizing licentiousness. If there is still impropriety . . . its supplement must be sought in the censorship of public opinion.” Or, if you are offended by it, don’t buy it. The Founders wisely left the decision about what publications should be read up to the individual reader. The First Amendment protects your right to decide what you will or will not read. By voting “Yes” you reaffirm your right to make your own decisions about what you will read.

On this 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights reaffirm your support for this important document. Rights are not determined by majority vote, nor should they be, but a reaffirmation of freedom is always needed.

John Whisman, Co-Chair
Maria Pinto, Co-Chair
First Amendment Coalition

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition 0
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition 0
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

We marvel as the Soviet people struggle to attain the basic rights that Americans have been guaranteed for 200 years under the Bill of Rights. Ironically, so accustomed are we to these freedoms, we also risk losing them bit by bit. Recently, we have seen the erosion of free speech from government-censored Persian Gulf war coverage to Mapplethorpe to rap music. The Soviets have shown themselves to be willing to fight for freedom of expression. We should do no less. Defend your constitutional rights. Vote “Yes.” Let freedom ring!

Greg Vogel
Business Consultant
George Meyer, member
American Civil Liberties Union

We must not trust government to determine the morality of speech or action. Contrary to the language and the spirit of the First Amendment, the Supreme Court, and lower courts, have determined that there are ideas and opinions that should be suppressed. The Court ruled that “community standards” can be an excuse to make exceptions to the First Amendment. Let’s establish a standard in our community opposing all forms of censorship. Vote “Yes”.

Glenn Cripe
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Government regulation of speech results in intellectual stagnation. Court rooms and prisons become the garbage heap of unpopular ideas or images. But these ideas or images force a society to ponder, to look at itself critically, to find truth, and create a better world in which to live. Freedom of expression is an inalienable individual right, as our Founders clearly recognized; those who want to restrict it, no matter what their excuses, oppose freedom.

Proposition “O” will remind the government and the citizenry that the First Amendment is the law. Supreme Courts and Attorney Generals may come and go, but the First Amendment must be preserved.

Jeffrey Jones
Californians Against Censorship Together

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed rights to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”; our Constitution was devised to protect these rights against government repression, by ascribing limited and clearly delineated powers. The intent of the First Amendment is to prevent government interference with individual freedom of thought and conscience. Today, the First Amendment is under attack from those whose intent is to impose their views on others. Proposition “O” supports, “without exception”, the First Amendment as the absolute law of the land, and says our government must cease breaking the law. Send a clear message that America’s tradition of liberty is alive in San Francisco. Vote “Yes”.

Mark Valverde

The Voter Pamphlet is [CENSORED].

City Attorney Renne has gotten local court authorization to censor dozens of ballot arguments — anything judged to be “false”, “misleading” or “irrelevant”.

Last time Mayor Agnos tried to deal land near City College to a profiteering developer, a ballot argument was censored because it mentioned the $60,000 Agnos once “forgot” to pay taxes on, as proving Agnos untrustworthy.

Renne’s rationale was that improprieties in Agnos’ past were irrelevant.

She’s entitled to her opinion.

But the government should have no right to censor its critics.

The idea of elections is for the voters to decide.

Print all opinions in the Voter Pamphlet.

Vote yes.

Grassroots

Send Jesse Helms a message that the First Amendment is alive and well in 1991. As we just saw in the Rust v. Sullivan decision, the First Amendment is being threatened. It is unacceptable for the Federal government to issue a gag rule attacking the right of a physician to counsel on abortion and to use the withdrawal of federal funds as an economic hammer against free speech. Vote “yes”.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

Two centuries ago, pornography was legal throughout the country.
But between the mid-1800s and mid-1900s, laws were passed against "vices"—abortion, gambling, alcohol, marijuana—including "obscenity".
And, after being sold legally for a century, Fanny Hill was banned.
Now the tide has turned. Fanny Hill is no longer illegal. But people still get arrested for selling books and films.
Nowadays it's legal to do most of the things it used to be illegal to even write about.
We have the right to take part in orgies—but not videotape them!
Pornography doesn't spread AIDS.
If America can tolerate sexual freedom in real life, we can tolerate it in literature and film.
Bring back the First Amendment. Vote yes.

Grassroots

Art does not flourish through censorship. Freedom of expression dies when an artist's First Amendment rights are denied. This has a chilling effect that imprisons the thoughts of the artist and encourages self-censorship out of fear; this will be felt for generations to come. Allowing books to be banned, records to be burned, or artists to be harassed and arrested for creating their own concept of art destroys a vital part of our society.
Keep the arts and all forms of expression alive and free. Vote "Yes".

Maria Pinto
The Avant Garde Society

If you knew what gets censored—you'd be surprised.
For instance, it's illegal for California political parties to announce positions on "non-partisan" elections.
This ridiculous law has never been enforced—except by City Attorney Renne, who used it as authority to censor candidate statements in the Voter Pamphlet.
The federal appeals court ruled this is an abridgement of free speech. The Supreme Court later voided that ruling on a technicality. So Renne's censorship has been ruled unconstitutional, but the law and her policy are still on the books.
Tell the City Attorney to stop acting like the City Censor.
Vote yes.

Grassroots

Nowadays, 90% of all "obscene" materials are legal.
Only "hard-core" is still denied freedom of press.
What's the difference?
It's supposed to be "community standards".
But laws should have objective standards.
How can record stores and museums know which music and art is illegal? As Supreme Court Justice Stewart stated in Jacobellis vs. Ohio (1964): "I know it when I see it."
Naturally, jurors may be biased. "Community standards" become double standards.
Nobody should have the right to impose their biases on others.
Our community standard should be:
LIVE AND LET LIVE; READ AND LET READ.
Vote yes.

Grassroots

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

PROPOSITION P
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?

YES ➡️
NO ➡️

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: From 1980 to 1989, an experimental program in California allowed physicians to prescribe hemp (marijuana) for certain medical purposes. State law no longer allows hemp to be used for medical purposes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P would make it City policy to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines. This measure defines “hemp medical preparations” as all products made from hemp, cannabis, or marijuana that are intended for the treatment of disease, the relief of pain, or for any other healing purpose. This measure calls for physicians to be allowed to prescribe hemp for medical purposes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this declaration of policy about hemp medical preparations.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “P”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition P:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How “P” Got on the Ballot
On July 29, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition P to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 19, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,620 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,221 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Hemp Medication

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

When the law unnecessarily interferes with good medical practice, everyone suffers.

Medical patients who become aware that the most effective and benign agent for treating their condition is legally unavailable are forced to choose between recovery and breaking the law. According to the National Cancer Institute, one third of cancer patients receiving chemotherapy decide to discontinue potentially life-saving or life-prolonging treatments because of severe and debilitating side effects which could be greatly reduced by a medicine which is legally forbidden. Otherwise law-abiding patients who choose to obtain this medicine, or family members or friends who do this for them, are forced to break the law and pay extremely inflated prices on the black market. When all their physical and emotional resources should be devoted to recovery, they are burdened with additional stress and anxiety through fear of prosecution.

Sincere and informed physicians and other medical personnel are forced to choose between their medical oath and a cruel law which prohibits them from giving the best medical advice and treatment to their patients.

Conscientious and informed law enforcement personnel are forced to choose between human decency and compassion, or duty, which requires them to interferre in medical practices in which they are not competent to make decisions.

Particularly during the past decade, the people of San Francisco have courageously borne a terrible burden as we have watched so many of our loved ones suffer and die. Much of this suffering and death is needless and could be prevented. Your vote in favor of Proposition P will send a message to all of California and the nation that we believe medical decisions are best left to qualified physicians and their patients.

Earl Galvin
Martin Kahn
Hemp Medication

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

I am a woman born with various disabilities and have tried numerous pain medications. All have caused severe vomiting, nausea, allergies and diarrhea. I have found that smoking marijuana is the one thing that keeps me out of emergency and helps to relieve the pain so that I can sleep. Marijuana also helps to stimulate my appetite so that I am able to eat.

Proposition P is a step toward helping me and others in similar circumstances stay alive. Please vote in favor of Prop P and help those who cannot take other medications.

Mary Gennoy

I am not a criminal, simply a person with AIDS. To relieve some life threatening symptoms I smoke marijuana. Fear grips me every time I am forced to buy on the black market — at exorbitant prices. Please help me to obtain legal marijuana. VOTE YES ON THE MEDICAL MARIJUANA INITIATIVE. It makes sense and is compassionate and necessary.

Rick Gilberg

Proposition P advises restoring hemp drugs (cannabis, marijuana) for medicinal use.

After a century of medicinal use, in 1937 hemp drugs were wrongfully removed from prescription availability and remain hostage to government "reefer madness" fiction.

Hemp drugs are effective and nontoxic for treating anxiety, pain, epilepsy, muscle spasm, anorexia, AIDS wasting syndrome, depression, and glaucoma.

A recent Harvard survey of physicians found willingness to prescribe cannabis, if available. The DEA administrative law judge Francis Young ruled that cannabis should be prescribed.

The initiative to RESTORE HEMP MEDICAL PREPARATIONS TO LIST OF AVAILABLE MEDICINES IN CALIFORNIA would help let physicians once again prescribe cannabis.

Tod Mikuriya, M.D., Psychiatrist,
Former Director of Marijuana Research
National Institute of Mental Health

Don't let narrow-minded politics interfere with good medicine. As women who have gone through chemotherapy and are surviving cancer, we ask that you vote yes on this important measure.

Jo Daly, San Francisco Police Commissioner (Retired)
Marguerite (Maggi) Rubenstein, RN, MSCC, PhD

NORML has heard from countless patients who find marijuana uniquely beneficial for nausea, AIDS wasting syndrome, spasticity, glaucoma, chronic pain, migraines, depression, epilepsy and other intractable complaints.

In 1988, Drug Enforcement Administration Judge Francis Young ruled that marijuana has clearly established medical value and should be available as a prescription drug. Nevertheless, the government won't allow marijuana to be prescribed for medical purposes.

Please vote yes on proposition P and signal our government that it is cruel to deprive patients of medical treatment.

Dale Gieringer, California National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws
Dennis Peron, Community Activist

Prior to the outlawing of marijuana in the 1930's, it was prescribed in this country for numerous ailments. Marijuana has recently been found especially useful in the treatment of glaucoma, cancer and AIDS.

Until 1989 Marijuana was available by prescription in California in limited cases. Since 1989 it has been unavailable under any circumstances, even to a doctor.

Our present policies of classifying marijuana as synonymous with heroin and more serious than cocaine, are not only factually incorrect but unfair. These policies deprive many seriously ill persons of the relief this relatively mild herb can bring to their suffering.

This is a humanitarian issue.

Terence Hallinan
Member Board of Supervisors

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

Marijuana has been used legally in the United States to control nausea and vomiting, and is known as a potent appetite stimulant. Physicians can prescribe morphine to control pain. They should also be allowed to prescribe marijuana to alleviate the side effects of cancer therapy, AIDS, and eye treatments.

Ivan J. Silverberg, M.D.
Ernest M. Rosenbaum, M.D.

Patients have the right to receive treatment that has been shown to be beneficial. Marijuana has been shown to be safe and effective, particularly for nausea, in people being treated for cancer, AIDS, and other serious illnesses. We support Proposition P.

David Siegel, MD, MPH
Norman Hearst, MD, MPH
Thomas J. Coates, PhD
Stephen B. Halley, MD
Leon H. Mckusick, PhD
Susan M. Kegeles, PhD
Susan M. Rubin, MPH
Mark T. Gould
Joey Taylor
Robert H. Hilliard, MA
Eve Golden, MS
Robert M. Thomas
Lee Middleton
William Wolf
Susan Folkman, PhD
Michelle Berlin, MD
William J. Woods, PhD
Jocelyn Lighhill
David R. Gibson, PhD
Larry Ostborn
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies
University of California at San Francisco

People suffering from cancer or HIV should be spared pain. Our county health director informs me this policy will help alleviate suffering from chemotherapy and other difficult treatments and serious illnesses. The Republican politicians in Washington are acting to remove this treatment even when prescribed by a physician for their patients who are in desperate pain. Vote “yes” on Proposition P.

Mayor Art Agnos

Pot is good for the heart.
The NAS reports: "Indices of cardiac performance usually improve".
The reason: pot relaxes and dilates blood vessels, opening them to more blood flow with less friction. This “substantial decrease in peripheral vascular resistance” means the heart can pump more, without increased effort.
"Cardiac output...has been found to increase by...as much as 30%"
Pot is “apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart”.
These quotes are from MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

Grassroots

Many epileptics say marijuana reduces their seizures.
Similar benefits are often reported by people with multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and various spastic disorders.
Almost all have to break the law to get their medicine.
The National Academy of Sciences concluded:
"There is substantial evidence...that cannabinoids are effective in blocking...seizures,...particularly cannabidiol (CBD)."
In the best-controlled human study, eight epileptics received CBD. Seven showed significant reduction in seizures; no signs of toxicity.
Yet if you supply the pot that helps a disabled friend become more able, you can go to prison.
Why?

Grassroots

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The Bush administration is trying to make patients accept "Marinol"—synthetic THC capsules—instead of real marijuana. Synthetics may be more profitable, but the natural herb is healthier.

"Marinol" is the most concentrated form of THC in history, therefore less safe.

"Marinol" contains only THC and no CBD, so it's almost useless for many purposes including seizure-prevention.

Asthma: smoking works better than capsules since it goes directly into the lungs.

Smoking takes effect in minutes; capsules can take an hour or more.

Many patients can't swallow a capsule without vomiting.

With smoking, you can tell when you've had enough; with capsules you have to guess.

The FDA approved imitation marijuana only because real marijuana was already known to be effective.

But the natural herb is more effective.

And safer.

So why can't doctors prescribe it?

Grassroots

The National Academy of Sciences concluded that pot relieves asthma attacks.

THC capsules work, but smoking pot was more effective, and works faster, since it goes directly to the lungs.

There are also special marijuana pipes which heat and vaporize the pot without burning it; you inhale fumes but no smoke.

Such pipes are especially recommended for asthma.

Yet they're illegal.

Smokeless pipes can produce bronchodilation to relieve asthma—without irritation.

Why are they illegal?

Grassroots

"ACTIVE AGAINST NAUSEA"

Some other drugs can suppress nausea, but pot actually increases appetite. (But not obesity.)

That's vital for nausea from chemotherapy or wasting syndrome due to AIDS or cancer. The NAS reports:

"... there is a need for new and more reliable anti-emetic agents.

"... There seems little doubt that THC and other cannabinoids are active against the severe nausea and vomiting produced by cancer chemotherapeutic agents.

"... Cannabis leaf, smoked or eaten, is also anti-emetic..."

Grassroots

GLAUCOMA BLINDNESS

The NAS report considered glaucoma, for which Robert Randall has been smoking ten joints/day since the 1970s—supplied by the government.

"GLAUCOMA...leading cause of blindness in the United States...characterized by an increase in intraocular pressure...300,000 new cases...each year...

"Cannabis...THC...and some other cannabinoid derivatives lower intraocular pressure..."

But, despite clear benefits, the FDA won't accept any more applications for government-grown pot. Even for those going blind.

Why?

Grassroots

The BAR/UPI (5/29/91) reports:

"DOCTORS AT ODDS WITH DEA OVER USEFULNESS OF MARIJUANA"

"Nearly half of cancer specialists surveyed said they had recommended at least one of their patients break the law and use marijuana to counter nausea from chemotherapy", according to a Harvard survey reported in Annals of Internal Medicine 4/30/91.

But the Bush administration and DEA refuse to acknowledge reality. They've granted a few dozen patients' requests for pot. But the vast majority have to break the law to get their medicine.

Until 1970, MDs could prescribe marijuana.

(Until the 1930s, you didn't even need a prescription.)

Bring back medical freedom!

Grassroots

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The National Academy of Sciences 1982 book, MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, makes clear that pot is less harmful than most other drugs (including alcohol and nicotine).

They concluded that pot has "very low lethal toxicity" and "no instance of human lung carcinoma attributable solely to marijuana smoking has yet been reported."

They found pot is "apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart and circulation" and "produced no evidence of brain atrophy" and "neither marijuana nor THC causes chromosome breaks."

Very few drugs could pass such exacting scrutiny! Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

I: The 12-9-87 Chronicle reports:

"3 S.F. HOSPITALS OK MARIJUANA, DOCTOR SAYS"

"At least three San Francisco hospitals routinely permit cancer patients to smoke marijuana because it relieves the violent nausea associated with chemotherapy, a doctor who practices in the city said yesterday."

"To be honest, I do not even think of marijuana as being illegal," said Dr. Ivan Silverberg, M.D., a doctor of oncology at UCSF."

"Dr. Ernest Rosenbaum, associate chief of medicine at Mt. Zion, said, "We are not against it, because marijuana makes most cancer patients feel more comfortable when they come in for chemotherapy. So we tactfully encourage it.""

Take politics out of the doctors office —

Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

A National Academy of Sciences committee found pot valuable for its "effect on appetite, nausea and vomiting, epilepsy, muscle spasticity, anxiety, depression, pain, and on glaucoma, asthma, and the symptoms of withdrawal from alcohol and narcotics."

"What is perhaps more encouraging than the therapeutic effects observed thus far is that cannabis seems to exert its beneficial effects through mechanisms that differ from those of other available drugs."

"This raises the possibility that some patients who would not be helped by conventional therapies could be treated effectively with cannabis."

Even when "conventional therapies" work, they're usually much more toxic than pot. If marijuana is apparently the safest and most effective medicine for some patients, their physicians should have the legal right to prescribe it. Vote Yes.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition P

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION P

RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE
HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE OF CAL-
IFORNIA.
I. The people of the City and County of San
Francisco recommend that the State of California
and the California Medical Association restore
hemp medical preparations to the list of available
medicines in California. Licensed physicians
shall not be penalized for or restricted from pre-
scribing hemp preparations for medical purposes
to any patient.
(1) Definition:
The term “hemp medical preparations” means
all products made from hemp, cannabis, or mari-
juana, in all forms, that are designed, intended,
or used for human consumption, for the treatment
of any disease, the relief of pain, or for any
healing purpose, including the relief of asthma,
glaucoma, arthritis, anorexia, migraine, multiple
sclerosis, epilepsy, nausea, stress, for use as an
antibiotic, an anti-emetic, or as any healing agent,
or as an adjunct to any medical procedure for the
treatment of cancer, HIV infection, or any other
medical procedure or herbal treatment.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158
in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday,
November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.,
Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. Election Day.
Take advantage of this option if you will not be able
to go to your polling place on Election Day.
Out of town on November 5, 1991? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333
PROPOSITION Q
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal
government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the
next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified
health and social welfare services and programs?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the federal
government decides how much of the fed-
eral budget to spend on various programs,
including the military.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition Q is a decla-
ration of policy that calls on the federal
government to reduce military spending
by 10% each year for the next 5 years. The
measure calls for the savings to be used
for better housing, education, health care,
AIDS and cancer research, job training
and employment opportunities, environ-
mental protection, mass transit, drug
abuse prevention and treatment, and defi-
cit reduction.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes,
you want to adopt this declaration of policy
about federal spending.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you
do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “Q”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the
following statement on the fiscal impact of Propo-
sition Q:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved,
in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of
government.

How “Q” Got on the Ballot
On July 25, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a
proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Doris M. Ward,
Harry Britt, Angela Alioto, Roberta Achtenberg, Terence
Hallinan, Willie B. Kennedy, Carole Migden, Kevin F. Shel-
ley and Jim Gonzales. The City Charter allows four or more
Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this
manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Federal Budget Priorities

PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q is your chance to send a powerful message to our nation's leaders: "It's time to bring our tax dollars home!"

During the past 12 years while military spending has doubled, federal support for San Francisco has decreased by 33%. That means less of our federal tax dollar is available to help our city with the urgent problems of homelessness, education, AIDS, mass transit, and other human and environmental needs.

Proposition Q says what we want more of our tax dollars used to help solve the crisis in our schools and on our streets. It's time to reverse the military spending frenzy of the 1980's. It's time to invest in our communities.

Military experts agree that we can cut military spending without weakening our defense. We don't need to spend billions on Stealth Bombers, MX Missiles, Star Wars, and the testing of new nuclear bombs.

Excessive military spending hurts our economy by adding to our national deficit and keeping interest rates high. Military spending creates far fewer jobs than spending on construction, civilian industries, education and health care.

Proposition Q is part of a national referendum that the voters of Chicago have already passed by a 74% majority. It will appear on local ballots across the nation in 1992. Let's make San Francisco the second major city to stand up for sanity in how our tax dollars are spent.

We cannot afford to remain silent while our precious resources are wasted on weapons we don't need for our defense. The health of our cities is vital to our national security.

As your local elected representatives, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition Q.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britz, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisor Maher

Absent: Supervisors Hsieh and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER's ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

We strongly support additional Federal help for San Francisco to fight AIDS and homelessness and to improve our educational and mass transit systems.

Passage of Proposition Q would injure all four of these causes.

We would like to believe that the folks in Washington might grant some of the so-called "saved" funds from the proposed Proposition Q budget cuts — and our already lost San Francisco Presidio payroll money — for our City's other needs:

- Unfortunately, San Francisco will never receive "dime one" of these alleged "savings".
- The closing of Letterman Military Hospital didn't help its AIDS patients.
- Let's not talk about what the Letterman closing did to the homeless veterans suffering from post-traumatic war stress.
- Strong majorities in the national Democratic and Republican Parties — over 80% in the U.S. House of Representatives — support current military budgeting levels as vital to United States safety and World Peace.

No doubt, some Exxon Oil executives would have liked Proposition Q-type budget cutbacks in place against all those "difficult" Coast Guardsmen overseeing the 1989 Valdez, Alaska tanker-spill cleanup operations.

Proposition Q will indeed send "a powerful message to our nation's leaders":

- To halt needed funds for San Francisco's AIDS patients and needy veterans . . .
- To put the Bay Area on the bottom of their flood control and water protection funding lists . . .
- To cutback on Presidio historical buildings preservation money . . .
- To lower Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers' resources for San Francisco Bay protection.

Vote AGAINST Proposition Q!!!

Citizens for Responsible Spending
Alexa Smith
Terence Faulkner

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

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q urges a 10% per year military budget cutback. A major problem with Proposition Q is that it doesn’t define which military programs should be cut:

The U.S. Army, its reserves, and the California National Guard proved to be indispensable in the emergency following the October 17, 1989 Earthquake.

The needs caused by natural disasters — often caused by earth, wind, and fire — cannot be regulated by such 10% statutory reductions.

Oil spills, ship collisions, and rampant drug smuggling are problems which will occupy the Coast Guard for many decades to come. Ship safety inspections and enforcement of maritime regulations are further Coast Guard duties that will not go away.

The hydra-headed nightmares created by toxic wastes will long pose grave burdens for the military. The cleanups of the 1991 Sacramento River’s 45 miles of pesticide pollution and the 1989 Valdez, Alaska oil tanker mess are cases in point.

Maintaining the promised quality of medical services to veterans and their families are a continuing ethical obligation of the United States government. We certainly don’t need to close down more facilities like Letterman Military Hospital!!!

Taking money away from the Army Corps of Engineers would be a quick way to sabotage flood prevention programs and the water quality of the San Francisco Bay and Delta.

Proposition Q’s budget cutbacks, if implemented, would impact directly — and adversely — on the Bay Region’s economy, public health, citizen safety, and environmental quality.

Unwise military cutbacks have already forced the planned closing down of the San Francisco Presidio as an Army base. Further military funds will still be needed to preserve the Presidio’s historical buildings for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Citizens for Responsible Spending
Alexa Smith
Terence Faulkner

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Reduced military spending benefits us all. A U.S. Conference of Mayors study found that a 10% shift from military to urban programs would result in a U.S. personal disposable income rise of $2.2 billion annually and greatly improved state and local tax revenues. Non-military spending creates more jobs. If Proposition Q's spending changes were implemented there would be a net annual increase of 477,000 jobs nationwide. Military programs also pollute. The Defense Department has created 14,401 toxic waste sites. The federal toxic cleanup budget is dwarfed by the Pentagon budget.

The opponents of Proposition Q must be pulling our leg. They must know that the services they mention, such as the Coast Guard and disaster relief, can be fully funded by a fraction of the bloated military budget we have today. Congress can easily make the cuts that Proposition Q calls for through elimination of unnecessary and wasteful military programs. Simply cutting "Black Budget" programs, such as post-nuclear war planning, would save the first year cuts. The Stealth Program alone will cost U.S. taxpayers 65 billion dollars if the Pentagon gets all the planes it has asked for.

It is only by shifting our spending priorities from military waste to education, health, employment training, transit, environmental cleanup and peaceful technology that we will improve the quality of life in our nation’s cities.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.

Absent: Supervisors Brit and Hsieh.

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

For the future of our city and our nation, join with us in voting yes on Proposition Q.

Assemblyman John Burton
Sheriff Michael Hennessy
Alex Forman, SANE/FREEZE
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
National Lawyers Guild Bay Area Chapter
I.L.W.U. Local 6
Buck Bagot, Member Bernal Hills Democratic Club*
Women’s Int’l League for Peace and Freedom
Neighbor to Neighbor
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Green Party of San Francisco
S.F. Gray Panthers
Cesar Ascarra
San Francisco Tomorrow
Greater Mission Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth*
Maryann O’ Sullivan, Exec. Dir. Health Access*
John Moran, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*
Physicians for Social Responsibility
American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Region
Religious Soc of Friends, Soc Concerns Committee
Bishop Melvin Talbert, United Methodist Church*
San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
Latino Issues Forum
United Educators of San Francisco
Roberto Hernandez, Mission Econ & Cult Assoc*
Abalone Alliance
San Francisco Urban League
Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
George Wesolek, Justice & Peace Commission, Catholic Archdiocese*
Veterans Peace Action
Dr. Amen Brown, Minister 3rd Baptist Church
Eva & Gene Royale - Chicano Latino Caucus*
Lulann S. McGill, Pres. NAACP Branch*
David Chaffield, Reg. Dir. Greenpeace Action*
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Marie C. Malliet, Pres. C.W.A., Local 9410*
Charlene Tschichart, St. Anthony’s Foundation*
David Hartsough

*For Identification Purposes Only

Bush spent $1 billion a day to kill hundreds of thousands of Iraqis in a war that benefited only big banks and oil monopolies. Bush’s invasion of Panama was another case of taxpayers financing a war of aggression against a Third World country. Bush’s “New World Order” is really the same old imperialism. We need money for jobs and human needs, not war! U.S. hands off Cuba and Korea!

Gloria Estela La Riva,
Candidate for Mayor

Reagan presided over the greatest military build-up outside of war. The transfer of wealth from taxpayer to defense industries continues. Our enemy isn’t some boogie man in the Middle East; our enemies are poverty, ignorance, and disease at home. Let Congress know you want America to be number one in quality of life, not arms sales. Vote “yes” on Q.

Green Party of California, San Francisco Local
Kim Gilgenberg, Coordinating Committee

The Cold War is over but the Pentagon keeps spending our money at record levels. This year the taxpayers of San Francisco sent $1.4 billion to the Pentagon — almost 50% more than in 1980. Yet federal support to our city for transit is down 54%, housing is down 61% and job training is down 86%. Homelessness, underfunded schools, the AIDS epidemic and inadequate medical care are not simply local problems. They should also be national priorities. Proposition Q is our chance to bring our tax dollars home. We need more money for schools and housing — not the MX Missile and new Stealth bombers. Proposition Q is part of a national referendum on the future of our nation and our city. Join the elected leaders of San Francisco who support Proposition Q. Vote yes on Proposition Q. Our future depends on it.

Alex Forman
SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security.

In 1981, the federal government spent $36 billion on housing. This year they will spend $7 billion. That’s why people don’t have homes, and a record number are homeless in every major American city. Vote “yes” on Proposition Q.

Mayor Art Agnos
Federal Budget Priorities

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q notifies the United States Congress that the City and County of San Francisco has developed, in addition to a notorious foreign policy, a domestic agenda. In fact, the City now wants to control the federal budget!

Vote "NO" on Proposition Q

Why can’t the members of the Board of Supervisors focus their attention on the needs of residents of the City and County of San Francisco? Why can’t the Board of Supervisors leave the federal budget to the United States Congress?

The Board and the Mayor can’t resolve San Francisco’s own budgetary problems but that doesn’t stop them from meddling with the federal budget! Sure, we want more money for housing, education, health care, job training and all the other necessities of our residents but let’s focus our energies and talents on what can be realistically accomplished in San Francisco. Let’s stop making our City look foolish!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION Q

"It is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that the federal government should reduce the military budget by ten percent (10%) each year for the next five (5) years, and use the savings to provide better housing, education, health care, AIDS and cancer research, job training and employment opportunities, environmental protection, mass transit, drug abuse prevention and treatment, and deficit reduction."
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!

---

NO DEJE QUE EL VIENTO SE LLEVE SUS PAPELES RECICLABLES!

Ponga sus papeles reciclables en bolsas de papel o amárrelos con cuerda.

Ayúdenos a mantener limpias nuestras calles mientras recicles!
OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

There continues to be considerable confusion about the rules and procedures governing absentee ballots. The results are that some voters do not vote and others send in ballots that are not counted because the proper procedures were not followed. Voters who wish to vote by absentee ballot should familiarize themselves with the following information:

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night time telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, you may have your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the absentee ballot return envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, or because of a physical handicap are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot be delivered to you by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. These ballots may not be mailed.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

Because of the large volume of telephone calls we receive prior to the election, we have revised our telephone system to improve our responses to your telephone calls.

When you call the Office of the Registrar of Voters at 554-4375, you will hear a recording offering you the following choices:

TOUCH-TONE PHONES  Press 1
SPANISH-SPEAKERS  Press 2
CHINESE-SPEAKERS  Press 3
ROTARY PHONES  Hold

For people with touch-tone phones, after you have Pressed 1, you will have the following options:

Voter Registration Information and Forms  Press 1
Absentee Voting Information and Forms  Press 2
Working at the Polls Information  Press 3
Candidates and Ballot Measures  press 4
Information about Registered Voters  Press 5
REPEAT — (Listen to choices again)  Press 9
Other Topics  Hold

Please write if you have suggestions for improving our telephone system.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Voter’s Quick Reference Card.
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**VOTER'S QUICK-REFERENCE CARD**

To save time and reduce lines, take this coupon with you to the Polls. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to "YES" or "NO" for each of the Local Propositions.

**PLEASE - Write the location of your Polling Place here—**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return Address

______

______

Germaine Q Wong
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA  94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ROOM 158 - CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Voter, the location of your polling place is shown on the label below.
Please DO NOT remove the label from the Absentee Ballot Application.

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - November 5, 1991 Municipal Election
SIGN this application and return it to the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address
City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote. My new address is printed below. (Do NOT use a P.O. Box or mail drop.)

Number and Street Name Apt. No.
City State Zip Code

Check Below All That Apply, Then Sign Your Name:
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for Nov. 5, 1991; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot if there is a Run-Off Election on Dec. 10, 1991.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Info Pamphlet in: Spanish ____, Chinese _____.

Your SIGNATURE - Do Not Print
Date Signed  Day Time Phone  Evening Phone
SAN FRANCISCO VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET & SAMPLE BALLOT

November 5, 1991
Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work on Election Day - November 5, 1991 as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic activity.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, November 5, 1991.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) ____________________ Your Signature ____________________

Print Your First Name ____________________________ MI ____________________________ Print Your Last Name ____________________________

Print Your Residence Address ____________________________ Zip Code ____________________________

Day Phone ____________________________ Eve. Phone ____________________________

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: ____________________________

I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other: ____________________________

------------------------------------ SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ------------------------------------

Assigned Precinct: ____________________________ Home Precinct: ____________________________

Affidavit Number: ____________________________ Clerk: [ ] Inspector: [ ]

[ ] E.O. Bk. [ ] 6/2 [ ] 6/6 Code ____________________________ Init'l. ____________________________

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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**BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE**

Nicholas deLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock, League of Women Voters
Richard Miller, San Francisco Unified School District
John Odel, National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio, Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means.") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

B 第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Pasa 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos cabecitas rojas.

D 第三步
请把握票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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.

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，有空白格供選民投票使用。

A 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

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.
IMPORTANT NOTICE — “OUT WITH THE GRAY”

For many years, a gray envelope has been provided for two purposes: (1) to cover your ballot, thus keeping it secret, and (2) to give you a place to vote for write-in candidates, by writing their names in the space provided on the envelope.

Starting with this election, the gray secrecy envelope has been replaced by a long card which is attached to your ballot and folds over to cover your entire ballot, thus maintaining the secrecy of your vote. Now you will use the long card to vote for your write-in candidates. Just write in their names in the space provided on the attached card.

Thank you for cooperating with this change to improve the election process.

NEW VOTING BOOTHS!

Shorter lines at your polling places! We now have 6400 voting booths — 1600 more than we had before. This means that there will be more booths in polling places, reducing the waiting time whenever there are a number of people who arrive at the same time to vote.

All parts of the voting booths are made from recycled materials, and can be recycled again. These booths are much less expensive than the booths we previously used — $60 instead of $350 for each one. In addition, they have proven to be sturdy and long lasting by many other cities and counties. Because they are easier to transport and assemble, as well as being easier to maintain, our costs for each election are reduced.

To taxpayers, these booths represent a one-time savings of over $1.5 million and an additional $15,000 – $25,000 each election.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs
____ Lost use of both hands
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair)
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed on October 7. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by October 17, please call 554-4375.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots which are mailed to voters, or given to voters who request them in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots are mailed back to the Registrar or deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall.

ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE (PROPOSITION M) — The Assessor determines how much money a piece of property would probably sell for on the open market. This figure is called the assessed property value. It is used to decide the amount people pay in property tax.

BINDING ARBITRATION (PROPOSITION B) — This happens when two disputing parties agree to have their conflict settled by a neutral third party. The two sides are then legally required to accept that settlement.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

CONDOMINIUM (PROPOSITION N) — A Condominium is an individually owned unit in a multi-unit building, such as an apartment.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS O, P, Q) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITIONS H, J, K, L, M, O, P) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

MEET AND CONFER (PROPOSITIONS C, D) — Before making changes in the terms of employment of City employees, the City must discuss these changes with the affected employee organizations.

MISDEMEANOR (PROPOSITION M) — This is a minor crime or offense that is punishable by a fine and/or a jail sentence of six months or less.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITIONS K, L, M, N) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

PROPOSITION — An issue which voters can vote to decide.

REFERENDUM (PROPOSITIONS L, M) — A law passed by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor does not go into effect for thirty days. If enough voters sign a petition during that thirty days, they can require that the law be placed on the ballot for the voters to approve. If the majority of voters vote “no” on that measure, then it will not become law.

REPEAL (PROPOSITION K) — This means you want to abolish an existing law.

ZONING (PROPOSITION L) — The City is divided into sections for different purposes, such as housing, business, playgrounds, etc., called zoning. Property in an area can only be used for the purpose for which it is zoned.

PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the November 5, 1991 Municipal Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote absentee) ................................................................. 7-13
2. the location of your polling place ........................................................................ (see label on the back cover)
3. applications for an absentee ballot and permanent absentee voter status ................................................................. back cover
4. a rights of voters summary .......................................................................................... 14
5. information for disabled voters .................................................................................. 15
6. statements from the candidates who are running for office ....................................... 16-22
7. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text ......................................................................... 24-157
8. definitions of words you need to know ........................................................................ 6
9. a Voter Quick Reference Card to mark your choices and use when you vote ............... inside back cover
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party, City &amp; County of San Francisco / Presidente, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR (ALCALDE) 市長</td>
<td>Cesar Ascarrunz</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de negocios / 酉人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Planteen</td>
<td>Small Business Owner / Dueño de una pequeña empresa / 小商業東主</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloria Estela La Riva</td>
<td>Union Newspaper Printer / Impresora de un periódico sindical / 工會報紙印刷師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dehnert C. Queen</td>
<td>CEO, Small Business Development Company / Presidente, Small Business Development Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>Assessor, City &amp; County of San Francisco / Asesor, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco / 营造商业发展公司行政總董</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Hsieh</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores / 市参议员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes</td>
<td>Party of Life, Leader / Partido por la Vida, Lider / 生命黨領袖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank M. Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joni Jacobs</td>
<td>Socialist Action Pro-Choice Activist / Activista de acción social a favor de tener la opción de aborto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Alioto</td>
<td>Supervisor, City &amp; County of San Francisco / Supervisor, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde / 市長</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party, City &amp; County of San Francisco / Presidente, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT ATTORNEY (FISCAL) 地方檢察官</td>
<td>Arlo Smith</td>
<td>District Attorney of San Francisco / Fiscal de San Francisco / 营造府地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF (SHERIFF) 縣警長</td>
<td>Michael Hennessey</td>
<td>Sheriff of San Francisco / Sherif de San Francisco / 营造府縣警長</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-2 17TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City’s ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texto en Español</td>
<td>Texto en Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá ofrecer la Ciudad incentivos de jubilación temprana durante febrero y marzo de 1992 a fin de reducir la cantidad de empleados, y deberán existir restricciones en las facultades que tiene la Ciudad de reemplazar a algunas de las personas con jubilación temprana hasta el 1 de julio de 1993?</td>
<td>市政府應否在一九九二年二月和三月期間鼓勵公務員提早退休? 應否限制市政府有等到一九九三年七月一日才能聘用人員替代某些提早退休者?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Podrá la Ciudad, en lugar de establecer los sueldos cada año mediante una fórmula, negociar sueldos y beneficios con ciertas organizaciones de empleados de la Ciudad, resolviéndose los desacuerdos por medio de un arbitraje que pudiera ser revocado mediante un voto de 2/3 del Consejo de Supervisores?</td>
<td>應否允許市政府與某些市員工組織集體談判制定工資和福利，若有爭議則由仲裁解決，但市參議會可以三分之二票數否決，而非每年採用一公式制定薪酬?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberán eliminarse de la Carta Constitucional ciertos reglamentos de contratación para el Servicio Civil, transferiéndose los mismos a la Comisión de Servicio Civil?</td>
<td>應否撤消市憲章規定的某些公務僱傭條例以便置於公務委員會的管理之下?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional a fin de ofrecer los mismos derechos de contratación para todos los postulantes con el mismo puntaje en una lista de servicio civil, y se otorgará a la Comisión de Servicio Civil la autorización de adoptar reglamentos que aumenten el número de postulantes que podrían ser considerados para contratación?</td>
<td>應否修正市憲章以便給予公務名單上具有同等成績的所有申請者同等僱用權利; 應否授權公務委員會制定規則，以便在公務名單上增加可能受傷的申請人數?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Los departamentos de la Ciudad tendrán el derecho de despedir a sus empleados, sujeto a apelación ante un funcionario externo, y tendrá la Ciudad el derecho de aceptar los procedimientos alternativos para el despido de empleados, incluyendo el arbitraje final y valedero?</td>
<td>應否允許市政府部門解僱職員但准予該職員向外界諮詢員提出申訴； 應否允許市政府同意採取包括有約束性的仲裁等別程序解僱職員?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Podrá el Consejo de Supervisores, cuando así se lo solicite el Alcalde, pagar a los empleados de la Ciudad la diferencia entre su sueldo municipal y su sueldo militar durante 180 días como máximo, mientras estén en servicio activo bajo circunstancias extraordinarias, siempre y cuando se cumplan ciertas condiciones?</td>
<td>應否允許市參議會在市長的請求下給予符合某些條件的在特殊情況下服役的市職員支付為期最多180日的軍薪和服職薪的差額?</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>G</td>
<td>Shall Housing Authority police officers be allowed to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor's Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor's compensation?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to create a Children's Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a &quot;domestic partnership&quot;?</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from &quot;P&quot; (Public Use District) to &quot;NC-2&quot; (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Opción</td>
<td>Texto</td>
<td>Número</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Podrán los oficiales de la policía de Autoridad de Vivienda convertirse en oficiales de policía de San Francisco si cumplen con los requisitos estatales y de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>107 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Deberá prohibirse a la Ciudad contratar en nombre del Alcalde a cualquier empleado, incluyendo al asistente del Alcalde, cuyas funciones incluyan la supervisión de cualquier departamento de la Ciudad, y deberá limitarse el sueldo de los empleados de la Oficina del Alcalde hasta un 70% del sueldo del Alcalde?</td>
<td>111 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional a fin de permitir que los residentes de San Francisco menores de 18 años de edad puedan ser nombrados a un consejo, comisión o organismo asesor, en caso de que la ley que cree dicho organismo permita tales nombramientos?</td>
<td>116 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Deberá requerirse que la Ciudad establezca un Fondo para la Infancia que será usado sólo para ciertos servicios adicionales para la infancia, reservando cierta cantidad de los ingresos por impuestos a la propiedad en dicho Fondo durante diez años, y deberá requerirse que la Ciudad prepare un Plan Anual de Servicios para la Infancia que establezca los objetivos de dicho Fondo?</td>
<td>120 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Deberá revocar la Ciudad la ordenanza que permite que dos adultos no casados y sin vínculo familiar que viven juntos y están de acuerdo en ser responsables conjuntamente de sus gastos básicos de vida establezcan su relación formalmente como “sociedad doméstica”?</td>
<td>125 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 SI</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>¿Se adoptará la ordenanza que cambia la zona del Circuito Phelan ubicado en las calles Ocean and Phelan en frente del City College de “P” (Distrito para Uso Público) a “NC-Z” (Distrito Comercial de Vecindario de Pequeña Escala)?</td>
<td>129 NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

十一月十一月五日舊金山市選舉 提交選民投票公決提案 市議提案
<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’s rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City’s unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression?</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified health and social welfare services and programs?</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>章目</th>
<th>提案内容</th>
<th>选项</th>
<th>说明</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>133 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>137 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>144 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>148 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>152 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA 選舉完畢**

一九九一年十一月五日舊金山市選舉 提交選民投票公決的提案 市縣提案
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before October 8, 1991.

Q — I moved on or before October 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after October 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between October 8 and November 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — You can vote for:
Mayor, District Attorney and Sheriff.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, November 5, 1991. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

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.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you. You may wish to take the Voter's Quick Reference Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don't know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted.

A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before November 5 if you:
- Fill out and mail in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. You will be sent an absentee ballot within three days after we receive your request. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from October 7 through November 5. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November 2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 5.

Q — If I don't use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include: your home address, the address to which you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:
ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from October 7 through November 5. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November 2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 5. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed on page 5 of this pamphlet may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 1528 Fillmore Street produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:
ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

MAYOR
The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City and County of San Francisco.
The term of office for the Mayor is four years. The Mayor is paid $129,090 a year.

SHERIFF
The Sheriff runs the county jails and provides bailiffs (security) for the courts.
The term of office for the Sheriff is four years. The Sheriff is paid $93,886 a year.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
The District Attorney prosecutes criminal court cases for the City and County of San Francisco.
The term of office for District Attorney is four years. The District Attorney is paid $116,584 a year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Mayor

ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 1930 Hyde Street
My occupation is Party of Life, Leader
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I have made no deals or commitments to any “Special Interest” nor will I. As Mayor I will proudly declare for all to hear that my employer is all the people of San Francisco — Democrats, Republicans, and Independents — of every neighborhood, of every economic group and every community. If hard work, dedication, and devotion to the office of Mayor will make San Francisco a better city, I will give it everything I have. It is from the people that the proud spirit of “I Will” springs. It is with the people that this spirit resides, spurring all of us to greater effort.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

TOM HSIEH

My address is 1151 Taylor Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: I want to make San Francisco world-class again. But it’ll take vision and guts to restore our economic health. Like the historic retirement program I created to trim the City’s payroll — without layoffs or cutting services — saving $25 - 35 million a year.

My blueprint for San Francisco is based on 5 common-sense themes...
A Safe City... with adequate law enforcement.
A Clean City... to live and work in.
A Competitive City... with a balanced budget and healthy economy.
A Liveable City... with services for families and the elderly.
A Fair City... with respect and equality for everyone.

Tom Hsieh

The sponsors for Tom Hsieh are:
Candidates for Mayor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO
My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: I have the most extensive executive management experience of any mayoral candidate. It must be management that serves all of San Francisco: environmentalists; all of our neighborhoods and movements; African Americans; Asians; gays and lesbians; Latinos and women.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I dramatically and progressively reformed the department and proved I can turn around a City.
I am the only candidate with a proven track record as Sheriff, Supervisor and Assessor.
Because of my record, I have received the endorsement of N.O.W.; the major gay and lesbian organizations; many Democratic clubs; and neighborhood leaders.

DEHNERT C. QUEEN
My address is 956 Sacramento Street, Apt. 305
My occupation is CEO, Small Business Development Company
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco’s past and present incumbents act to enhance only THEIR future — NOT the people who pay their wages.
I’ve proven Mission Bay, Waterfront, transit plans:
• Will increase cost-of-living $282/month/resident!
• Transit extensions will be obsolete upon completion (year 2000)!
• $7.3 BILLION BEING MISUSED AGAINST US!
My plans create:
• PRIVATELY-FUNDED Worldwide Business Gateway — housing, ballpark, commerce, SKILLED jobs. I raised needed $625 million!
• INTEGRATED transit — CalTrain/Metro constructed in THREE, not eleven years.
• SAVES TAXPAYERS $2.7 BILLION!
My Committee Against Mission Bay PREVAILED (1990)!
BUT, Agnos, Alico, Hongisto, Hsieh have quietly formalized Agnos’ plans ADMINISTRATIVELY!
Want More? ASK!
VOTE!

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:
Carlota Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, School Board Member.

The sponsors for Dehnert C. Queen are:

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

GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA

My address is 3207 Mission St. #9
My occupation is Union newspaper printer
My qualifications for office are: People’s needs first, not profits.
Housing, healthcare, AIDS funding, jobs, schools, transit, libraries, comprehensive senior services, youth programs, arts, environmental protection, earthquake safety, substance abuse programs, childcare, should be guaranteed rights. Fund programs by taxing large corporations’ profits. Oppose racism, sexism, homophobia, AIDS discrimination, police brutality. Strengthen affirmative action. Defend union rights. Affordable housing must be a right! Build housing, use Presidio, freeze rents, real vacancy control. Defend reproductive rights. Embargo South Africa. Support Palestinian national rights. Oppose military spending, war. Ultimately, we need socialism, based on people’s needs, not profits.

Gloria Estela La Riva

The sponsors for Gloria Estela La Riva are:
Danny Anderson, 171 Fell St., #41, Outreach Worker for Homeless.

PETER PLANTEEN

My address is 1060 Powell St. #32
My occupation is Men’s Clothing Store Owner
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: I am a small but successful businessman who would run the City of San Francisco, exactly the way I’ve run my business.
I would bring imagination and a hands on policy on every issue. My experience dealing with people all of my adult life will help me find solutions out of problems and then solve these problems.
I have never held political office before, but I do not consider that a liability. In fact, I consider that an asset, because I will bring my businessman’s mentality to City Hall and offer a fresh and logical approach to city government.

Peter Planteen

The sponsors for Peter Planteen are:

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

CESAR ASCARRUNZ

My address is 3140 Mission Street
My occupation is businessman
My qualifications for office are: I have been a successful businessman in San Francisco for the past 30 years. I have proven business management skills with a strong academic background.

Over the past 10 years I have been active in benefits for integration teachers and education, gay, lesbian and woman rights, hispanic pride, the homeless and the environment.

I have been an advisor for business and cultural affairs as a member of multiple community organizations which have earned me the unofficial title of the Mayor of the Mission District.

Cesar Ascarrunz

The sponsors for Cesar Ascarrunz are:

ART AGNOS

My address is 106 Dorchester Street
My occupation is Mayor of San Francisco
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: The job of government is to be a friend to those who would be vulnerable without it: any of us can find ourselves powerless, any worthy concern can start out friendless.

As Mayor, I’ve championed our city’s earthquake recovery and our water system; and a real reforming convention planner and building our emergency response. I’ve won new AIDS funding, increased child care, implemented Prop M, and am expanding mass transit.

We’re opening the waterfront by tearing down the Embarcadero Freeway, we’re opening opportunity by building affordable housing and vacancy control and we’ve opened government to all. I respectfully offer my candidacy.

The sponsors for Art Agnos are:

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

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a native San Franciscan and mother of four, I cannot tolerate seeing San Francisco turned into a dull, harsh place.

Our City’s health is in jeopardy as City Hall closes human services, ignores dirty streets, lets MUNI deteriorate and forces businesses to flee.

As your Supervisor, I’ve worked to preserve effective programs that:

• care for the mentally ill
• provide shelter for abused women and children
• prevent AIDS through education and intervention
• provide mobility to seniors.

With new leadership in the Mayor’s office, a change of priorities, and some Alioto energy, we can restore health to the City we all love.

Angela Alioto

The sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

JONI JACOBS

My address is 774 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Socialist Action Pro-choice Activist
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: My program that says human needs are human rights:

• Funded abortion rights and child care.
• House the homeless.
• Free health care for all, including people with AIDS.
• Quality public education — no teacher layoffs or cutbacks!
• Union scale for workers on city contracts — no wage freeze!
• Union-scale job training for youth and unemployed workers.
• End police brutality against minorities and gays; Black community control of police.
• Tax the rich and corporations to fund human needs — no regressive taxes!
• No money for war or prison construction!

The bosses have two parties. Workers need a labor party to represent them.

Vote Socialist Action!

Joni Jacobs

The sponsors for Joni Jacobs are:
FRANK M. JORDAN

My address is 3350 Laguna Street, #101
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans have had sand kicked in their faces by the bully in the Mayor's office. Does Art Agnos work only for himself, or for you? I've worked FOR San Franciscans for 33 years — building over 1,000 SAFE neighborhood blockclubs and starting our Senior Escort Program. As Chief, I founded our Hate Crimes Unit and the school anti-drug program. I fought to integrate the SFPD, appointing the highest-ranking Black, Latino, Asian and Women officers and actively recruiting Lesbians and Gays.

As Mayor, I will ban Agnos' Deputy Mayors and audit every department eliminating waste. Make San Francisco work for you.

Frank M. Jordan

The sponsors for Frank M. Jordan are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., State Senator/Attorney.
Candidate for District Attorney

ARLO SMITH

My address is 66 San Fernando Way
My occupation is District Attorney of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: I’m very proud of what my office has accomplished since I’ve been San Francisco’s D.A. Among our many achievements:
- An award-winning Hate Crimes Unit that was California’s first;
- A Drug Strike Force targeting upper-level drug dealers that’s achieved a conviction rate of 95%;
- A Consumer/Environmental Protection Unit that’s one of the best and most effective in California;
- A Family Support Bureau collecting some $17 million annually for 15,000 dependent children in San Francisco;
- A Domestic Violence Unit that’s a nationwide model.
I ask for your vote to continue to serve San Francisco.

Arlon Smith

The sponsors for Arlo Smith are:

Candidate for Sheriff

MICHAEL HENNESSEY

My address is 261 Anderson Street
My occupation is Sheriff of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: As Sheriff, I have kept my promise to restore safety and security to the jails. I have significantly improved training for deputy sheriffs and have instituted nationally acclaimed county jail prisoner education and vocational programs.
I have also kept my promise to bring women and minorities into top management and to create a permanent program to assist senior and disabled citizens facing eviction.
My pledge to you is a Sheriff’s Department dedicated to equal justice and compassion for all San Franciscans.
Your strong support recognizes our past achievements and provides the foundation for continuing progress.
Thanks for your support.

Michael Hennessey

The sponsors for Michael Hennessey are:
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against the measures. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None have been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure and one argument against the measure are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge. These arguments are called the "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument."

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" only indicates that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency.

Rebuttal arguments are printed following the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments which will be published in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

Paid arguments are printed following the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order, but are arranged to make the most efficient use of each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. They are printed as submitted. No corrections are made to spelling and/or grammatical errors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Early Retirement

PROPOSITION A
Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City’s ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees may retire at age 50 if they have worked for 20 years or at age 60 if they have worked for 10 years. Generally, an employee’s pension increases with the number of years worked, the employee’s age and salary. Once a retired employee leaves the payroll, the City may fill the position immediately.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A is a charter amendment to encourage employees (other than firefighters, police officers, and those in the state retirement system) to retire early. For retirement purposes, qualified employees would be treated as if they had worked three years longer and were three years older. This would allow some employees to retire who are not now eligible. Also, it would increase the retirement pay of employees who are already eligible to retire. Employees would have to retire on or after February 1, 1992 and before March 31, 1992 to qualify under this measure.

Proposition A would require that certain jobs left vacant by early retirement be eliminated. A committee made up of the Mayor, Controller and General Manager of Personnel would recommend which jobs to eliminate. Two persons chosen by the San Francisco Labor Council would serve as advisory members. First, the committee would decide which jobs could not be eliminated. Under Proposition A these include: City officers, jobs producing money for the City, jobs paid for by money the City receives from state or federal government, jobs vital to public health, safety and transit, and jobs required by law.

Second, the committee would recommend which of the remaining vacant positions to eliminate. The Mayor would have to eliminate 500 or 50% of those jobs, whichever is more. The jobs would be eliminated from the budget until July 1993 unless the Mayor recommends filling the jobs and 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors agree.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could result in a net savings of approximately $20.5 million in fiscal 1992-93 and similar savings could recur in subsequent years. This is due to a projected increase in the cost of the City’s Retirement System of approximately $4.5 million in 1992-93, offset by an estimated $25 million in salary savings from positions vacated through early retirement.

Based on estimates from the Retirement System, approximately 1500 employees might accept the provisions of this measure and vacate their positions. The amendment sets a minimum of 500 or 50% of the vacated positions to be removed from the budget in 1992-93, but allows the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to add back positions by a two-thirds vote. If 500 positions are removed, salary and fringe benefit savings of approximately $25 million per year could result. The actual savings may vary depending on the number of early retirees, their respective salary levels and the number of positions and length of time they are held vacant.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 31, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, and Carole Migden.
Early Retirement

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Early Retirement charter amendment is a win-win proposition for San Francisco. The City will reward its long-time employees and at the same time save millions of dollars. This is a sensible way to pare down the City’s payroll.

Proposition A will save between $25 and $37 million a year for San Francisco. That’s money that we can direct towards critically needed programs and services for our neighborhoods, our children, the homeless and all San Francisco residents.

Reducing the City’s payroll through this Early Retirement program will help the City live within its means. Proposition A requires that a minimum of 500 positions be eliminated from the City budget.

A yes vote is a vote to offer a golden handshake to those who have provided long-term service to our city. Employees who are eligible to retire early will receive their full pension benefits.

We will then be able to eliminate positions that are non-essential for the provision of city services. And we will not lay off any workers! Everyone in San Francisco will be a winner if you vote yes on Proposition A!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez and Migden.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

City government needs reforming.
In 1985, I publicly warned officials about the fiscal chaos the City would experience unless decisive changes were made in management and finance practices.
Those changes never came and San Francisco has been riddled with debt and mismanagement since.
Proposition A contributes to reform. It lets City workers with lengthy service take early retirement. Minimally, 500 voluntary vacancies will be created. These non-essential slots cannot be refilled by the mayor. There are no forced layoffs.
This measure saves San Francisco $25 million annually. Still pressing is the need to reorganize our 66 departments. My campaign has laid out a comprehensive plan to restructure City government.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

As the author of Proposition A, I urge you to support this measure. Your yes vote will help restore fiscal responsibility to City Hall. In recent years we have let the size and cost of government spiral out of control, but now we have a chance to reverse that trend.
This measure will eliminate 500 non-essential positions without layoffs and create a $25 to $37 million annual savings, all without reducing services! Savings can be used to improve local programs. San Francisco will become a competitive and liveable city again.
Raising fees and taxes is not the only way to create revenues. It is time to bring common sense to our fiscal policies. I urge you to vote for Proposition A so we can take the first step!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I advocate a "yes" vote. Measure A reduces city employment by offering long-term employees early retirement. The savings would be $20.5 million. Essential city services will be protected because no police or firefighter positions will be left vacant under Proposition A.

Mayor Art Agnos

Rarely can voters cut the cost and size of government and provide funding for necessary programs with one vote, but Proposition A provides that opportunity.
Proposition A provides an incentive for City employees to leave their employment thru an early retirement program, reducing jobs without the need to lay off workers. Savings can be used for needed services and programs or to reduce the cost of government.
Proposition A commits the City to reduce its payroll, abolishing at least 500 positions vacated by those who retire.
Business and Labor urge you to join them in voting Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
Stan Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Stephen Cornell, Past President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

Question — Is it possible to develop a major job reduction, cost saving program without causing lay-offs of City employees who have given loyal service to San Francisco citizens?
Proposition A provides a positive answer to the aforementioned question and serves as proof that Business, Labor and City Government can work together to develop an early retirement program that reduces jobs while at the same time preventing lay-offs. Proposition A also commits the City to reduce on-going pay roll costs by not replacing 500 workers who retire early at a cost savings of 20 million dollars.
The San Francisco Labor Council strongly urges a yes vote on Proposition A, which is truly a win-win situation for all San Franciscans.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition A

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 thereto, providing for early service retirement.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.517-2 EARLY SERVICE RETIREMENT
(a) The retirement board shall provide an incentive for members under sections 8.509 and 8.584 to retire early for service by increasing the member's age and credited service for both qualification and benefit computation purposes by three (3) years.

This early retirement incentive shall apply only to members who retire from service with an effective date of retirement on or after February 1, 1992 and prior to March 31, 1992. This benefit increase will not apply to a vesting retirement.

(b) No later than April 1, 1992, the retirement board shall assemble and transmit to the Mayor's office a list of all positions vacated as a result of early retirement incentive created by this section. Immediately thereafter, the Mayor shall convene a review committee consisting of the Mayor, Controller, and the General Manager, Personnel, or their designees and two labor representatives appointed by the San Francisco Labor Council who shall serve as advisory members of the committee. That committee shall review all positions identified in the aforementioned list for the purpose of determining which positions must be filled ("mandated positions") according to any one of the following criteria:

(1) positions designated as officers by Section 1.103 of this charter;
(2) positions determined to be vital to public safety or the delivery of health and transit services;
(3) positions which the city is under a legal duty to fill pursuant to consent decree, memorandum of understanding in effect prior to August 1, 1991, contract, state or federal law, court decisions, or other legal requirements;
(4) positions that produce revenues or reimbursements to the city or positions funded substantially through enterprise funds or funds provided to the city through grants, or state or federal reimbursements or bond proceeds.

Thereafter, the review committee shall calculate the number of non-mandated positions that were vacated. The committee shall review each non-mandated position and make a recommendation as to which positions should be abolished. In order to maximize the cost savings benefits of early retirement, the review committee shall give special attention to reviewing those positions with salaries in excess of $60,000.

The Mayor shall receive and review the recommendations of the review committee and thereafter is authorized and directed to abolish in the 1991-92 fiscal year budget at least 500 or 50% of the vacated, non-mandated positions on the list, whichever is greater. The Mayor shall effect that abolition by transmitting a communication to the controller and the Board of Supervisors identifying the positions that have been abolished. In addition, the City shall abolish the same positions in the fiscal year 1992-93 budget and salary ordinance. It is not the intent of this section that work performed by such abolished positions shall be contracted out.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned abolition of positions, upon the recommendation of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, by a two-thirds vote, may restore to the 1991-92 budget or place in the 1992-93 budget any of the aforementioned non-mandated positions.

(c) The early retirement benefits offered under this section shall not be interpreted to apply to the provisions of Charter Sections 8.509(f) and 8.584-6. The early retirement benefits under this section shall be limited by the maximum percentage limitations in Charter Sections 8.509(b) and 8.584-2.

The early retirement benefits under this section will be limited by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Collective Bargaining

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The wages of most City employees are set each year based only on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Benefits such as dental care and vacation can only be added or changed with voter approval. Other terms of employment, such as uniform allowances, are negotiated with employee organizations through collective bargaining.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B is a charter amendment that would allow employee organizations representing most City workers to negotiate wages, hours, benefits and other working conditions through collective bargaining. Employee organizations would have a choice of this extension of collective bargaining or having their terms of employment set as they are now. The decision by an employee organization to choose collective bargaining would be permanent.

If parties could not reach agreement through collective bargaining, each side would submit a final offer on disputed issues to an arbitration board. The arbitrators would choose either the City's or employee organization's entire offer without change. The arbitrators must consider the cost of living, wages and benefits paid elsewhere, the City’s financial situation and other factors. The arbitrators’ decision could be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, which could choose the other side's final offer by a 2/3 vote.

For employees not represented by an employee organization, terms of employment would be set by the Mayor subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors. Proposition B would not affect the civil service provisions on hiring and promotions. Generally, the way retirement benefits are set would not change.

As a result of previous negotiations of various issues including a wage freeze, if Proposition B passes a majority of City workers will get dental coverage.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

The proposed Charter amendment allows employee unions representing approximately 24,000 City, School District and Community College miscellaneous (non-teaching) employees the option to either negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, or to remain under existing formulae which set salaries by a survey of local employers and require voter approval to change benefits and working conditions. As a product of the application of this change, the cost of government could increase or decrease, depending on the outcome of future negotiations and arbitration awards.

Any change in the manner of setting salary and fringe benefit rates can have a substantial effect on the cost of City government since total salary and fringe benefit costs for the employees potentially affected by this charter amendment amount to slightly less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Also, in my opinion, costs for negotiation, grievance and arbitration services will increase in a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount.

Additionally, this amendment would allow provisions of current memoranda of understanding with some affected employee organizations to take effect. These memoranda provide:

- The City will allow certain employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992-93;
- A dental plan will be adopted effective April 1, 1992, estimated to cost $13 million per year;
- Unions agree not to contest in court the 1991-92 salary freeze which avoided approximately $62 million in salary and benefit costs;
- City will adopt 1992-93 salary rates using existing formulae.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B IS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE REFORM SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS NOW.

Present economic realities call for reforming City employee salary setting standards, providing fiscal checks for the City and flexibility for City workers. This year, the City saved $62 million, crucial to balancing the budget, as a result of City employees foregoing scheduled salary increases.

The current system for setting City employee salaries locks the City into yearly automatic salary formulas and pay increases. Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State.

Most importantly, Proposition B requires evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and ability to pay BEFORE setting wages and benefits for City workers.

• Proposition B allows for negotiation of wages and benefits for City and County employees.
• Proposition B will eliminate the automatic employee pay raises which increase the City’s annual budget.
• Proposition B requires binding arbitration for peaceful resolution of labor disputes.
• Health insurance is such a basic necessity but many City employee families don’t have adequate coverage. Proposition B allows City employees to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

VOTE YES on Proposition B to provide a fair, impartial, and fiscally responsible way to determine wages, health benefits and working conditions for City employees.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, former Police Chief Al Nelder, Rev. James McCray, School Board members Tom Ammiano and Carlota del Portillo, Community College Governing Board President Mabel Teng, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco Police Officers Association, the San Francisco Firefighters, and the Central Labor Council urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Behind the lofty words in Proposition B are the self-interests of the powerful political establishment in San Francisco. Proposition B will turn city unions into franchises to collect dues — but city workers will have no rights. Big Brother “arbitrators” will make all the important decisions.

Proposition B blurs the divergent interests of management and workers and erodes the basis of independent worker organization. Its purpose is to inhibit the ability of city workers to take defensive action.

Proposition B sets up a vertical, bureaucratic structure with no room for democratic participation. Proposition B hides with obscure, legal wording an anti-democratic viewpoint: negotiations behind closed doors, appointed highly paid arbitrators, extra pay for favored city bureaucrats. Thus it institutionalizes bureaucratic social control over city workers.

City workers have had to suffer through two wage freezes with no recourse to strike action. The Chamber of Commerce and its political friends are supporting Proposition B clearly in order to impose a third wage freeze. City workers have become the scapegoats for inefficient top-heavy city management and the failure of the established political structure to present any solutions to our social problems. This process of disempowerment ensures that workers and tax payers will be further denied a voice about their jobs and city services.

STOP BIG BROTHER CONTROL!
FOR REAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING!
NO ON B!

City Workers for Real Unionism
Earl Gilman
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

City workers need real collective bargaining. But Proposition B sets up compulsory arbitration — the opposite of collective bargaining. Though Proposition B contains a few “carrots” for workers, it is basically a “stick” which hands complete power over wages and fringes to a three person board of arbitrators. They are appointees — not democratically elected. Moreover, there is no mention in Proposition B how or when these arbitrators can be removed. City workers will be at the mercy of the "board." It is naive to assume this board — though claiming impartiality — will not be influenced by political pressure. In fact, the third person on this board — the tie breaking vote — will be one of the most powerful people in San Francisco.

Proposition B allows the board to meet "privately," which really means secretly, thus allowing for deals behind the backs of union members. Also hidden in the wording of Proposition B are special financial “incentives” for individual managers, who are already very well paid. Favoritism is almost inevitable, because Proposition B contains no controls on these pay-offs.

City unions will inevitably become appendages of the “board.” In the Soviet Union workers once had unions like this — controlled by the state — but these workers now are demanding real unions including the right to strike.

Why are we going backwards in San Francisco while in the Soviet Union and other countries workers are demanding their rights? Many unions, unfortunately, have become businesses collecting dues from members and are no longer interested in organizing the unorganized. Under Proposition B, unions won’t have to organize. Workers turn cynical and apathetic when wages are frozen and hiring freezes result in speed-up. Proposition B will reinforce this process with the result of turning our unions into company unions.

CITY WORKERS FOR REAL UNIONISM
Earl Gilman, Secretary

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a well-conceived, thoughtfully drafted reform. It is the result of hundreds of hours of negotiation and careful consideration.

Proposition B is fair to both the City as well as City workers. Proposition B will allow the City to consider the overall budget picture rather than be locked into automatic salary pay increases and formulas. This will provide more flexibility in the budgetary process, and will assist in the maintenance of vital City services.

Proposition B will preclude strikes through the use of the peaceful method of arbitration.

Under Proposition B, City workers will be allowed to negotiate for salaries and health benefits, just like employees in the private sector.

A Yes Vote on Proposition B will help modernize an outdated salary setting system and will provide fiscally responsible reform. Vote Yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

Proposition B will reform the city’s current salary setting process by allowing employees to negotiate for wages and benefits. Your Yes vote on Proposition B, will insure that wage increases for city workers will be based upon the city’s ability to pay, not a rigid salary survey.

Proposition B requires that disputes be resolved by arbitration, not strikes. Charter prohibitions against strikes remain unchanged.

Proposition B provides a fair, impartial and fiscally responsible way to fix salaries and benefits.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Donald D. Doyle, President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Sonia Melara, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Harold M. Hoogastan, President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
James D. Jefferson, Past President, San Francisco Black Chamber of Commerce

Proposition B solves two of the City’s major problems by creating a much needed expansion of the collective bargaining process to include wage and benefits. In addition, Proposition B provides a one year wage freeze which will help resolve the City’s serious financial short-fall. In truth Proposition B is a “bridge over troubled waters”. A bridge constructed through the efforts of both City employees and City Government.

For far too long, San Francisco’s workers have been denied true collective bargaining.

Proposition B provides a choice for San Francisco Labor Unions to enter into the new collective bargaining program or to remain under the present formula system. Proposition B also saves the City at least 62 million dollars by acceptance of the wage freeze.

The Proposition B bridge was built through the tireless efforts of concerned citizens who are looking to a financially secure future while giving consideration to the basic rights of all citizens.

Approval of Proposition B will protect citizens from the flow of turbulent deficit waters. San Francisco voters have the power to place the last and most important piece in the bridge by voting Yes on Proposition B.

The San Francisco Labor Council strongly recommends a Yes vote on Proposition B.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition B. Today’s workforce has more women and more minorities, but our Charter locks in a system created when that wasn’t true. New issues important to today’s workers — child care, dental care, dependent health care, disability pay — shouldn’t be kept off the bargaining table because we locked in a system that reflected yesterday’s workforce issues. This measure recognizes the right of today’s workers to bargain for today’s needs.

Mayor Art Agnos

PROPOSITION B IS SOUND FISCAL REFORM

Proposition B is based on sound economic benefits to the City and to San Francisco taxpayers.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Presently, the City uses formulas and the combined salaries of what other Bay Area City’s pay their employees to set City employee wages. This locks the City in to pay increases regardless of the overall financial climate.

Proposition B places a provision in the City Charter that is badly needed, the provision that will require evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and it’s ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers.

With this safeguard, Proposition B creates a balanced salary setting plan for City and County workers. It gives City and County workers the ability to negotiate for an equitable wage and benefit plan and it provides fiscal checks and balances for the City.

Allowing City workers the ability to negotiate their salaries and benefits is a better way to do business than the “take it or leave it” approach that often results in strikes and conflicts.

Rigid salary formulas for all city workers drive annual increases far beyond the City’s ability to pay and have added tens of millions of dollars in needless expense to the City Budget. Proposition B will enable the City to hold the line on salaries.

To insure that the City’s employee salary setting standards remain on solid economic footing in the years to come, I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Louis J. Giraudo
President, San Francisco Bread Co.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B BRINGS FAIRNESS TO SAN FRANCISCO LABOR RELATIONS

We support Proposition B because it represents a fair and equitable form of labor relations for City workers.

Collective bargaining and binding arbitration are basic labor issues. Proposition B changes the current City employee salary setting standards to provide greater flexibility for City workers and their families.

Proposition B will provide, for the first time, the ability for City workers to negotiate for health benefits for their families. This is a basic necessity whose time has come.

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Strikes will be precluded, since Proposition B utilizes the peaceful method of arbitration to settle grievances and disputes.

Proposition B will bring San Francisco in line with other Bay Area cities and counties who already allow their workers to negotiate through collective bargaining and binding arbitration.

For fairness, equity, and flexibility, we urge you to support Proposition B.

VOTE YES ON PROP B.

San Francisco Labor Council
SEIU, Local 790
SEIU, Local 250
S.F. Firefighters
San Francisco Police Officers Association

Proposition B is reasonable and responsible change worthy of your support and your vote.

Proposition B changes the current system for setting salaries that mandates automatic salary formulas and pay increases and provides for collective bargaining, the process by which the City and City employees will be able to negotiate wage and health benefits. Isn’t it only fair for City employees to have the same right to negotiate wages and health benefits that exists in the private sector?

Proposition B is a sensible plan that will preclude strikes.

Proposition B is fiscally responsible reform. It has safeguards to help protect the City during difficult economic times.

Please join me in voting for Proposition B.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE

Proposition B makes good sense from a City management, City employee, and an economic point of view.

That is why we urge you to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY MANAGEMENT

Proposition B makes good sense for City management because it will require evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and its ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers. That is just good business sense.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY EMPLOYEES

Proposition B makes good sense for City employees because it gives them the same rights to negotiate for wages and benefits which employees throughout the State already have. And, it gives them the ability to choose better health coverage for their families instead of pay increases. At a time when so many families need better health coverage, this is a sensible option.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD ECONOMIC SENSE

Proposition B makes good economic sense because it will change the rigid salary formulas which currently lock the City in each year regardless of the budget realities, pitting them against the many vital services the City needs to have money to pay for.

Proposition B is a well thought out compromise plan which will meet the needs of the City and provide fairness to City employees.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE.

Please join us in voting yes on Proposition B.

Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Senator Milton Marks
Assemblymember John Burton
City Attorney Louise Renne
Civil Service Commissioner A. Lee Munson
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Naomi Gray
Nancy C. Levin, Former Public Utilities Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION B WILL HELP FAMILIES RECEIVE AFFORDABLE HEALTH BENEFITS

Today, over SIX MILLION Californians have no health insurance at all, and millions more have inadequate health coverage for themselves and their families.

It seems fair that City employees would have the option of choosing to negotiate for affordable health benefits for their families rather than salary increases. Until now, that has not been possible.

Proposition B will provide City employees with the ability to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

That is why we urge you to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Proposition B is meaningful reform. In the current economic climate, Proposition B is timely. Virtually all other counties throughout the Bay Area already allow their employees these rights and benefits. Proposition B will move the City forward in a positive direction.

This year, the City was able to save $62 million in the budget through employees foregoing salary increases. Providing a more equitable salary and health benefit plan for City employees in the future will go a long way towards providing fiscal flexibility for the City and fairness to its employees.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Joseph P. Lacey, Housing Committee at Old St. Mary's
Lulu Carter, 1st Vice Chair, Democratic Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Pres., Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Sharon Eberhardt, President, Greater Mission Democratic Club

PROPOSITION B IS FAIR AND SENSIBLE REFORM

San Francisco has a proud history for fairness and for sensible reform.

Proposition B is sensible reform timely and in the best interests of San Francisco taxpayers, and to the City employees we depend on to provide critical services we have come to expect.

That is why we urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

This year the City saved $62 million because of City employees foregoing salary increases. But without meaningful changes, this will only be a one-year fix for a more fundamental issue.

Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State. It is an equitable plan which has been taken into consideration what is best for the City and contains a number of safeguards to make sure that the City's economic position is protected in all negotiations.

And, at a time when affordable health insurance is such a basic necessity for all families, Proposition B will allow City employees the ability to negotiate for health benefits as opposed to salary increases. This is only fair.

I had the responsibility for protecting the City's economic well-being and worked under a different salary setting standard.

Proposition B is the sensible and fair, fiscally responsible reform needed at this time in the City's history.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Former San Francisco Mayor Joseph L. Alioto

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

Vote No — "B" is an outrageous proposal concocted by the mayor and municipal workers' unions to raid our treasury on behalf of 46,000 active and retired Municipal workers.

Vote No — it takes from the voters and gives the mayor and workers' unions power to invalidate all voter laws regulating duties, hours, conditions and benefits of workers.

Vote No — it forces workers to join a union. It sets up a 3-tiered system of setting all compensations and conditions, giving workers the choice of the system in the workers' best interest, not the taxpayers'.

Vote "B" No — Supervisors will never select impartial arbitrators. During the past two strikes Supervisors picked arbitrators selected by the unions. I know. I was there.

Vote No — Current laws regulating compensations are fair to workers and taxpayers. Not once since these laws were adopted by the voters in 1976 have they been adhered to. What we really need is someone to sue the mayor and Board to forcing them to follow the law.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor

Proposition B is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It has been broadly propagandized to San Francisco taxpayers as a cost saver. It is nothing of the sort; it eliminates almost all the limitations upon the power of the incumbent Mayor and Board of Supervisors to grant approximately 29,000 public employees unprecedented salaries, benefits and other favors. The Charter limitation of like pay for like work is eliminated and replaced with glittering generalities. The Charter requirement of voter approval of a dental plan is circumvented by a legal artifice which, according to the Controller, will cost $13,000,000 per year. An expensive additional bureaucracy is established for purposes of binding arbitration if an impasse occurs between employee organizations and the City. None of the arbitrators need be a public officials accountable to the taxpayers of San Francisco; none need even live in San Francisco! Proposition B also creates another City employee relations board although we already have such a board in the Civil Service Commission. That's why the Controller states that Proposition B will increase costs in "a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount." Finally, it allows certain public employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992 at a cost of approximately $1,000,000 per year and effectively eliminates the requirement of voter approval to increase benefits or change working conditions.

Proposition B is unjustified and I urge a "NO" vote.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

I strongly support collective bargaining, but Proposition B is a bad deal for the City. Proposition B means collective bargaining only for some employees. Proposition B retains our old salary setting method that has caused inflated wages for our employees.

Wage reform must be universal and fair to employees and the City. Proposition B is not a reform. The City will incur enormous costs from using two salary methods. Massive tax increases will be needed to pay for this election year giveaway by Art Agnos to his favorite union buddies.

Do not be misled. Vote NO on Proposition B!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

The City Charter currently provides that the salaries of approximately 29,000 City, School District and Community College employees are based on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Like pay for like work is the principle. Salaries and fringe benefits currently amount to just less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Now, as part of a “budget agreement” for fiscal year 1991-92, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors would have us approve a more expensive arrangement. In addition to permitting public employee unions unlimitedly to negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, Proposition B expressly allows binding salary setting, benefit and working condition decisions by non-public officials, non-residents (who are accountable to no one!), two additional City employee paid holidays for three years, at a cost of $1,000,000 per year and a dental plan which alone will cost the City an extra $13,000,000 per year, according to the City Controller. Reposing salary and compensatory benefit discretion in the present Board of Supervisors and Mayor is just asking for financial trouble, especially with almost final decision-making power in non-elected “arbitrators” who account to no one and needn’t even live in our City!

A memorandum of understanding with the City allows the unions, even those that opt for collective bargaining, to use the old formulas next year to catch up from the 1991-92 wage freeze. According to budget analyst Harvey Rose, "Employees will receive salary standardization . . . and, in addition, may receive further adjustments from the outcome of the collective bargaining for 1992-93."

If you believe that our current system treats City workers fairly, you’ll vote against this costly measure.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION B

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5 and 8.409-6 relating to rights and obligations of employees and employer concerning bargaining and impartial arbitration of employment disputes for miscellaneous employees.

The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5, and 8.409-6 to read as follows:

NOTE: These Sections are entirely new.

Part IA: Rights and Obligations of Employees and Employer Concerning Collective Bargaining and Impartial Arbitration of Employment Disputes.

8.409 Declaration of Policy
It is hereby declared to be the policy of the city and county of San Francisco that strikes by city employees are not in the public interest and that, in accordance with Government Code Section 3507(e), a method should be adopted for peacefully and equitably resolving disputes. It is the further purpose and policy of the city and county of San Francisco that in the event the procedures herein adopted are invoked by the city and county of San Francisco or by a recognized employee organization representing employees covered by this part, except as otherwise provided herein, they shall supersede and displace all other formulas, procedures and provisions relating to wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment found in this charter, in the ordinances and resolutions of the city and county of San Francisco, or in the rules, regulations or actions of boards or commissions of the city and county of San Francisco.

The provisions of charter section 8.346 shall remain in full force and effect and shall not be subject to the provisions of this part.

In accordance with applicable state law, nothing herein shall be construed to restrict any legal city rights concerning direction of its work force, or consideration of the merits, necessity, or organization of any service or activity provided by the

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

City. The City shall also have the right to determine the mission of its constituent departments, offices, boards and commissions; set standards of services to be offered to the public; and exercise control and discretion over the city’s organization and operations. The City may also relieve city employees from duty due to lack of work or funds, and may determine the methods, means and personnel by which the city’s operations are to be conducted.

However, the exercise of such rights does not preclude employees or their representatives from utilizing the grievance procedure to process grievances regarding the practical consequences of any such actions on wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment whenever memoranda of understanding providing a grievance procedure are in full force and effect.

It is the declared intent of the voters that the state statutes referenced in this part be those in effect on the effective date of this part.

8.409-1 Employees Covered
These provisions of Sections 8.409 through 8.409-6, inclusive, shall apply to all employees as described in Section 8.401 of this charter and including employees of San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Any recognized employee organization, on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect not later than January 3, 1992 to have wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment set pursuant to this part. Thereafter, any recognized employee organization which has remained within the coverage of Sections 8.401 and 8.407 on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect to be covered by this part; provided however, such election shall be effective nine months from the date of that election. Any election to be covered by this part shall be irrevocable, and affected classifications will not thereafter be subject to the provisions of sections 8.401 and 8.407 of this charter. Employees in classifications represented by a recognized employee organization which does not wish to be represented by this part shall continue to be covered by the provisions of sections 8.401 and 8.407 of this charter and such classifications shall not be covered by any of the provisions of this part.

Nothing herein shall preclude a recognized employee organization from electing to include employees in classifications covered by section 8.403 of this charter within the coverage of this part as a separate bargaining unit, provided however, that the election shall be irrevocable and such employees shall not thereafter be subject to the provisions of section 8.403.

Employees in classifications not represented by a recognized employee organization as of January 3, 1992 shall be entitled to represent themselves with the city and county over wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment to the extent required by state law and shall not be subject to the provisions of Sections 8.401 and 8.407, or the arbitration provisions of Section 8.409-4 of this charter. The Mayor annually shall propose all forms of compensation for unrepresented employees including salaries, hours, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment subject to approval or disapproval of the board of supervisors. Consistent with other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission may adopt rules and procedures relating to said unrepresented employees.

In addition, subject to the approval or disapproval of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor may, for employees designated as management, a management compensation package that recognizes and provides incentives for outstanding managerial performance contributing to increased productivity and efficiency in the work force. In formulating such a package, the Mayor shall take into account data developed in conjunction with the civil service commission regarding the terms of executive compensation in other public and private jurisdictions.

8.409-2 Interim Provisions

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.407 of this charter, from January 3, 1992 through March 31, 1992, in return for acceptation of a wage freeze for fiscal year 1991-92, all recognized employee organizations representing classifications electing to remain within the coverage of charter sections 8.401 and 8.407 may, on a one time only basis, elect to bargain for no more than two additional paid training or furlough days per year to be effective only in fiscal years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95, and a dental plan, in recognition of the wage freeze for 1991-92. Such bargaining shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided herein or any other provision of the charter, ordinance, or state law.

8.409-3 Obligation to Bargain in Good Faith
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, or of the ordinances, rules or regulations of the city and county of San Francisco and its departments, boards and commissions, the city and county of San Francisco, through its duly authorized representatives, and recognized employee organizations representing classifications of employees covered by this part shall have the mutual obligation to bargain in good faith on all matters within the scope of representation as defined by Government Code section 3504, relating to the wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of city and county employment, including the establishment of procedures for the resolution of grievances concerning the interpretation or application of any agreement, and including agreements to provide binding arbitration of discipline and discharge; provided, however, that, except as otherwise provided by law, matters within the jurisdiction of the civil service commission which establish, implement and regulate the civil service merit system shall not be subject to bargaining under this part: the authority, purposes, definitions, administration and organization of the merit system and the civil service commission; policies, procedures and funding of the operations of the civil service commission and its staff; the establishment and maintenance of a classification plan including the classification and reclassification of positions and the allocation and reallocation of positions to the various classifications; status rights; the establishment of standards, procedures and qualifications for employment, recruitment, application, examination, selection, certification and appointment; the establishment, administration and duration of eligible lists; probationary status and the administration of probationary periods, except duration; pre-employment and fitness for duty medical examinations except for the conditions under which referrals for fitness for duty examinations will be made, and the imposition of new requirements; the designation of positions as exempt, temporary, limited tenure, part-time, seasonal or permanent; resignation with satisfactory service and reappointment; exempt entry level appointment of the handicapped; approval of payrolls; and conflict of interest.

Nothing in this paragraph shall limit the obligation of the civil service commission to meet and confer as appropriate under state law.

Unless and until agreement is reached through bargaining between authorized representatives of the city and county of San Francisco and authorized representatives of recognized employee organizations for the first memorandum of understanding covering the classifications covered by this part, or a determination is made through the procedure set forth in section 8.409-4 hereinafter provided, no existing wages, written terms or conditions of employment, fringe benefits, or long-standing past practices for said employees shall be altered, eliminated or changed except in cases of emergency. This paragraph shall be effective only until the approval of the first memorandum of understanding with a covered employee organization or six months from the effective date of this part whichever occurs sooner.

During the term of an MOU, disputes regarding changes in wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided in this part, but may be subject to grievance arbitration.

No bargaining unit may be included in more than one memorandum of understanding with the city and county of San Francisco. Departmental or bargaining unit memoranda of understanding operative on the effective date of this part shall continue in effect until their expiration date or for three years, whichever occurs first, and may be renewed thereafter only as part of a master city-wide memorandum of understanding.

Agreements reached pursuant to this part by the authorized representatives for the city and county of San Francisco, on behalf of its departments, boards and commissions, and the authorized representatives of recognized employee organizations, once adopted by the board of supervisors, shall be binding on the city and county of San Francisco, and on its departments, boards, commissions, officers and employees and on the recognized employee organizations and their successors, and all employees in classifications they represent. Except as specifically set forth in this part, said agreements shall supersede any and all other conflicting procedures, provisions and formulae contained in this charter, in the ordinances of the board of supervisors, or in the rules or regulations of boards or commissions of the city and county of San Francisco, relating to

(Continued on next page)
wages, hours, or other terms and conditions of employment.

8.409-4 Impasse Resolution Procedures

(a) Subject to Section 8.409-4(g), disputes pertaining to wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment which remain unresolved after good faith bargaining between the city and county of San Francisco, on behalf of its departments, boards and commissions, and a recognized employee organization representing classifications of employees covered under this part shall be submitted to a three-member mediation/arbitration board ("the board") upon the declaration of an impasse either by the authorized representative of the city and county of San Francisco or by the authorized representative of the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute.

(b) Not later than January 20 of any year in which bargaining on an MOU takes place, representatives designated by the city and county of San Francisco and representatives of the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining pursuant to this part shall each select and appoint one person to the board. The third member of the board shall be selected by agreement between the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization, and shall serve as the neutral chairperson of the board.

In the event that the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining cannot agree upon the selection of the chairperson within ten (10) days after the selection of the city and county and employee organization members of the board, either party may then request the American Arbitration Association or California State Mediation Service to provide a list of the seven (7) persons who are qualified and experienced as labor interest arbitrators. If the city and county and the employee organization cannot agree within three (3) days after receipt of such list on one of the seven (7) persons to act as the chairperson, they shall randomly determine which party strikes first, and shall alternately strike names from the list of nominees until one name remains and that person shall then become the chairperson of the board.

(c) Any proceeding convened pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformance with, subject to, and governed by Title 9 of Part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The board may hold public hearings, receive evidence from the parties and, at the request of either party, cause a transcript of the proceedings to be prepared. The board, in the exercise of its discretion, may meet privately with the parties to mediate or mediate/arbitrate the dispute. The board may also adopt other procedures designed to encourage an agreement between the parties, expedite the arbitration hearing process, or reduce the cost of the arbitration process.

(d) In the event no agreement is reached prior to the conclusion of the arbitration hearings, the board shall direct each of the parties to submit, within such time limit as the board may establish, a package last offer of settlement on the remaining issues in dispute. The board shall by majority vote decide which package most nearly conforms to those factors traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of public and private employment, including, but not limited to: changes in the average consumer price index for goods and services; the wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment of other employees in the city and county of San Francisco; health and safety of employees; the financial resources of the city and county of San Francisco; other demands on the city and county's resources; revenue projections; the power to levy taxes and raise revenue by enhancements or other means; budgetary reserves; and limitations on the amount and use of revenues and expenditures.

The board, by majority vote, shall enter a written decision selecting the package of one or the other parties involved in the dispute.

(e) To be effective the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year, an agreement shall be reached or the board shall reach a final decision no later than sixty days before the date the Mayor is required to submit a budget to the board of supervisors, except by mutual agreement of the parties. After reaching a decision, the board shall serve by certified mail or by hand delivery a true copy of its decision to the parties. Except as otherwise provided by this part, the arbitration decision shall supersede any and all other relevant formulae, procedures and provisions of this charter relating to wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment, and it shall be final and binding on the parties to the dispute. However, the decision of the board may be challenged by either party pursuant to Title 9 of part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

Within 8 working days of the board's issuance of its written decision, the authorized representative of either party may appeal from the decision of the board to the board of supervisors. The appeal shall be filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors and served on the other party by the clerk. The board of supervisors may reject the decision of the board within 21 days of the filing of any appeal. Subject to the provisions of this section, if the board's decision is not overruled by a motion of the board of supervisors on a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3), the decision shall become final and binding. Should the board of supervisors overrule the decision of the arbitration board, the last best offer package of the other party shall become effective. Thereafter, the city and county of San Francisco, its designated officers, employees and representatives and the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute shall take whatever action necessary to carry out and effectuate the final decision.

(f) The expenses of any proceedings convened pursuant to this part, including the fee for the services of the chairperson of the board, the costs of preparation of the transcript of the proceedings and other costs related to the conduct of the proceedings, as determined by the board, shall be borne equally by the parties. All other expenses which the parties may incur are to be borne by the party incurring such expenses.

(g) The impasse resolution procedures set forth in Section 8.409-4, or in any other provision of the charter, ordinance or state law shall not apply to any rule, policy, procedure, order or practice which relates or pertains to the purpose, goals or requirements of a consent decree, or which is necessary to ensure compliance with federal, state or local laws, ordinances or regulations. In the event the city acts on a matter it has determined relates to or pertains to a consent decree, or in the event the city acts to ensure compliance with federal, state, or local laws, ordinances or regulations, and the affected employee organization disputes said determination, that determination or action shall not be subject to arbitration, but may be challenged in a court of competent jurisdiction.

8.409-5 Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, retirement and death allowances shall continue to be set and adjusted pursuant to Chapter Five of this Article.

However, death benefits and survivor allowances, retirement allowances, adjustments to retirement allowances and adjustments to continual allowances payable by the retirement system and based on fiscal year 1991-1992 wages and salaries covered by charter section 8.407, shall be calculated for all employees covered by charter sections 8.401 and 8.407 based on the rates certified by the civil service commission to the board of supervisors as though the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance went into effect by the mayor had become law. No such payment shall exceed the maximum amount permitted by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, or the maximum amount which would still permit the retirement system to preserve its tax-qualified status under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

After June 30, 1992, adjustments to retirement allowances and any continual allowances shall not be greater than they would have been had the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance went into effect by the mayor become law.

8.409-6 Employee Relations Rules

Within sixty (60) days of adoption of this amendment, the Mayor shall appoint a panel which after consultation with all parties of interest, shall review the current employee relations ordinance and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for such changes as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this part.

Such changes shall include the creation of an employee relations board. The duties of the employee relations board shall include hearing and making determinations concerning unfair labor practice charges, disputes regarding representation matters, and unit determinations.
Civil Service Rules

PROPOSITION C
Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period are part of the Charter. The Charter can be changed only by the voters. Other employment rules are in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission can change these Rules after public hearings. Generally, the City must also meet and confer with employee organizations representing employees affected by the rule changes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would remove from the Charter the rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period and place them in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. This measure would allow these rules to be changed by the Civil Service Commission after public hearings and, where required, meeting and conferring with employee organizations.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove these rules from the Charter and place them in the Civil Service Commission Rules.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep these rules in the Charter.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Since this measure takes charter provisions which at present can only be changed by a vote of the electorate and incorporates them as Civil Service Rules which may be administratively revised, in my opinion, there is no direct cost effect. However, future rule changes could increase or decrease costs in presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Civil Service Rules

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

As part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, we need Proposition C to begin the long-overdue modernization of our Civil Service operations.

During the past year, the Civil Service Commission conducted an in-depth study of ways to improve operations and reduce costs. The Commission conducted four months of public hearings, listening to hundreds of individual's testimony.

The Commission concluded, "The present Civil Service Charter provisions lead to excessive delays, red tape, and millions of dollars of unproductive operating expenses for City Departments." With the passage of Propositions C, D and E, the Commission estimates the City workforce could be reduced by 2%, for an annual savings of $20 to $30 million.

Proposition C modernizes some of the archaic personnel procedures now in the Charter. Ten Charter sections consisting of detailed personnel rules would become Civil Service Commission Rules. These Rules would be updated by the Commission.

The Commission would continue as appropriate to hold public hearings and meet and confer sessions with employee organizations before making any changes in these Rules.

The ten Charter sections that would become Commission Rules deal with qualification of applicants, examinations, protests of exams and eligible lists, examination procedures for veterans and employees on military leave, duration of eligible lists, limited tenure appointments, temporary and emergency appointments and dismissals during the probation period.

Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to insure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition C will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Don’t be tricked. In recent years the Civil Service Commission has abandoned its role as an independent enforcement agency. It is now a rubber-stamp commission that allows political appointees to do whatever they want — at great cost.

Gone is fairness in the top levels of City employment. Back is favoritism. People with the right friends have the most access to high-paying City jobs; and Civil Service does nothing to prevent this.

The departments are the ones claiming "cost savings" because they want a free hand to pick whomever they want for City jobs. The Chamber of Commerce wants you to vote for this so they can get their friends City jobs.

Civil Service is supposed to make sure that jobs are filled from lists of qualified candidates. Civil Service is responsible for exams, so if any candidate who makes the list is not qualified, it’s the Commission’s own fault.

Civil Service has also neglected to develop certain lists altogether, particularly for top positions. That way, the departments can choose whomever they like for lucrative jobs.

If the Commission were doing what the Charter mandates, we wouldn’t have so many high-paid, overlapping bureaucracies.

We are not afraid of change; we are afraid of what will happen if you give the Commission, and by extension the Mayor and his department heads, a free hand in hiring.

We need our resources to go toward services, not patronage.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

Don't be mislead by fancy words and false promises.
Under the guise of "modernizing civil service," this proposition opens the door to political patronage in City employment.

Voters have spoken on this issue many times — as recently as last November, when "exemptions" for top deputies in the Public Utilities Commission were handily defeated. The last time the City tried to sneak these same "modernizations" past the electorate, you voted it down overwhelmingly.

This proposal will not correct problems in Charter rules; The real problem is the City's failure to live within the rules.

This measure will not save money — it will cost money. Lots of it. The payroll will become further bloated with high-paid political appointments, exempt and "temporary" positions — all of which cost real money. This diverts funds from necessary services to reward friends of department heads and politicians.

The real reform that is needed is for the City to live within the merit system by providing regular, non-biased civil service exams, not by giving the people in power the right to change the rules to meet their whims.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C — stop political patronage.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Propositions C, D and E will begin the process of modernizing the Civil Service System — a job that is long overdue.

Under current rules, an individual who scored 70% on a test must be hired, even though there are candidates for this job who scored 95% the next time a test was given.

The opponents of Proposition C agree the system isn't working. Yet they urge you to maintain the status quo. That doesn't make good business sense.

Proposition C, D and E, the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, could save the City an estimated $20 million to $30 million a year in unnecessary spending, while broadening job opportunities.

Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to ensure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system. It will in no way encourage or increase patronage. Proposition C has nothing to do with the number of exempt appointments or high-paying jobs in City Government.

Proposition C will begin the process of modernizing the inefficient, slow and costly personnel procedures currently being used. The public hearing process, before the independent Civil Service Commission, will be maintained to ensure the fairness of the process. Allowing personnel procedures to be updated through public hearings and meetings DOES NOT increase patronage.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Civil Service Rules

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

For good government and a modern personnel system, support transfer of Civil Service procedures from the Charter to Commission rules.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition C, will reform the city’s outdated civil service system, without harming merit hiring protections.

The Charter currently restricts the Civil Service Commission’s ability to produce examinations and lists of job applicants in a timely way.

Proposition C will give greater flexibility to the Commission, reducing the costs of operating the examination process while producing better hiring lists.

Join business, labor and our elected officials in voting Yes on Proposition C.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

City workers ought to be able to bargain over workplace rules. Currently our system is so rigid that it takes years to offer exams for positions. Vote “yes” to modernize our out-of-date system.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

• ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
• MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
• BROADER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
• FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
• MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is not reform — it’s a power grab!
San Francisco government hardly needs more politics in its hiring practices.

The mayor repeatedly abuses his hiring authority. He circumvents merit selection, favors outsiders, and creates fat-salaried posts for political patronage.

Proposition C is the latest power grab!
San Francisco was spilling with red budget ink this year. City workers went without raises, and deep cuts were made in health programs. Despite these sacrifices, the mayor created a new — $120,000.00 — position in Civil Service.

Why? So Mayor Agnos could replace the general manager with his own political appointee — while keeping the old general manager on payroll. We’re now paying two people the salary of general manager!

More padding is going on at Social Services and Health Departments.

Imagine the outcome if the merit selection laws are stripped away. Proposition C is a power grab!

Richard D. Hongisto, Assessor

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, relating to qualifications, examinations, eligible lists, provisional appointments and dismissal during probation, and adding new section 8.320-1 incorporating the provisions of the above sections into Civil Service Commission rules.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, and adding new section 8.320-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.320-1 Incorporating Former Charter Provisions

The provisions of the following sections of the Charter, in the form existing prior to November 1, 1971, shall be incorporated in the rules of the Civil Service Commission, and shall remain in effect until or unless amended by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to its charter authority and subject to any applicable meet and confer or bargaining requirements under state law.

8.320 Qualification of Applicants
8.321 Examination of Applicants
8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers
8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles
8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations
8.328 Promotional Examination for Employees on Military Leave
8.330 Duration of List of Eligibles
8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments
8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments
8.340 Dismissal during Probationary Period
8.390 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.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed forces 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 at the time of appointment.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed forces 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 at the time of appointment.

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take such 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 10 days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned. (Amended November, 1986)

8.321 Examination of Applicants

All applicants for places in the classified service shall submit to examinations which shall be competitive provided, however, that no examination shall be deemed to be competitive unless two or more persons shall participate, except that any such examination may be held for one qualified applicant on recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors, after a finding by the board that a reasonable public interest in the proposed examination has been given. Such examinations shall be without charge to the applicants. The commission shall control all examinations and may employ suitable persons in or out of the public service to act as examiners. The examination shall measure the relative capacities of the persons to perform the functions, duties and responsibilities of the classification to which they seek appointment. Examinations shall consist of selection techniques which will test fairly the relative qualifications, merit and fitness of the applicants for the position to be filled.

Examinations may include written tests to determine job-related aptitude, knowledge, or achievements and oral tests by qualifications-appraisal boards. The Civil Service Commission shall establish rules governing the size and composition of qualifications-appraisal board. Qualifications-appraisal boards may consider, in the case of employees of the City and County of San Francisco, all prior performance evaluations completed on city service forms and in the case of all applicants may be a part of their evaluation of candidates for employment to any position. Appropriate rosters of eligibles established by a trade, craft, or occupation joint apprenticeship committee recognized by the State of California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards, may be utilized to fill apprenticeship positions or as the basis for establishing apprenticeship eligibility list. The commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of the tests to rate the capacity of the applicants to perform service for the city and county. The commission may, for each examination, establish a passing mark or may determine the total number of persons who shall constitute the list of eligibles. The commission shall prepare from the returns of the examiners the list of eligibles, arranged in order of relative performance. No question submitted to applicants shall refer to political or religious opinions or fraternal affiliations. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three working days for entrance examinations or five working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the Civil Service Commission. The amount of such fee shall be determined by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligible's rank and score, except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test, shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period, the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period, the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond 60 days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment(s) to the adopted eligible list. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations

Veterans with 30 days or more actual service, and widows or widowers of such veterans, who become eligible for appointment by attaining the passing mark in any entrance examination, shall be allowed an additional credit of five percent in making up the list of eligibles established by such examination. The term "Veteran" as used in this section shall be taken to mean any person who has been mustered into, or served in, or enlisted in the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Air Corps, the United States Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard, and served on active duty in said branch of the armed forces of the United States, not including reserve service, at any time for a period of 30 days or more in time of war and been separated from active duty and under conditions other than dis

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C (Continued)

honorable and not resulting from court martial, except to individual entering the armed forces on or after January 27, 1973, the date of the creation of the volunteer army, shall receive veterans preference in a civil service examination for service in the armed forces of the United States. In addition, an individual qualifying for veterans preference as herein defined shall be deemed entitled thereto on his or her date of separation from active duty in the armed forces.

No person so qualified shall be granted veterans preference unless he or she indicates qualification therefor on an examination application received by the Civil Service Commission not later than 10 years from the date of his or her first enlistment thereto. When an eligible has secured a permanent appointment from a list of eligibles derived from an entrance examination, in which he or she has been allowed additional credits of five percent as herein provided, and has served the full probationary period therein as provided in this Charter, such other additional credits of five percent that have been allowed him or her on the list of eligibles, derived from other entrance examinations shall be automatically canceled; and his or her rank on such other list or lists revised to accord with his or her relative standing before such additional credits were added and he or she shall not be allowed such additional credits in any other examinations. The Civil Service Commission, for services or employment specified by the commission, allow general or individual preference, but not more than 10 percent, for entrance appointment of veterans who have suffered permanent disability in the line of duty, provided that such disability would not prevent the proper performance of the duties required under such service, or employment, and provided that such disability is of record in the United States Veterans' Administration.

Definition of Time of War.

In the administration hereunder of the provisions of this section of the Charter, the expression "time of war" shall include the following periods of time:

(a) the period of time from the commencement of a war as shown by any declaration of war, of the Congress of the United States, or by any statute or resolution of the Congress, a purpose of which is to declare in any manner the existence of a state of war, until the time of termination thereof by any treaty, treaty of peace, cessation of hostilities, or otherwise;

(b) the period of time during which the United States is or has been engaged in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared;

(c) the period of time during which the United States is or has been assisting the United Nations or any nation or nations in accordance with existing treaty obligations, in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared;

(d) the period of time during which the United States is engaged in a campaign or expedition in which a medal has been authorized by the government of the United States; provided, however, that no person shall be eligible for the benefits provided for veterans in this section unless he shall have been eligible to receive such a medal.

8:328 Promotion Examinations for Employees on Military Leave.

Employees under permanent Civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in Section 8:324 of this Charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotive eligible list, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the Civil Service Commission within 20 days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within 20 days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The Civil Service Commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The Civil Service Commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or more than the minimum passing mark established by the Civil Service Commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall then be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified candidates in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules and provisions, but subject to the completion of probationary period as provided in Section 8:340 of this Charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibility for procurement standing through examinations shall be subsequent to the original promotional examination.

It is determined by the Civil Service Commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination—during his term of service—had the name of such person appeared thereon; then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that the certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom:

8:329 Duration of Lists of Eligibles.

The Civil Service Commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles so secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8:331 Limited Tenure Appointments.

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedures as provided under Sections 8:320, 8:321, 8:324 and 8:330 hereof, the Civil Service Commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to position through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the Civil Service Commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled—pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedures as provided in Sections 8:320, 8:321, 8:324 and 8:330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments." and may continue only

(Continued on next page)
until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.320 thereof, but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the Civil Service Commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.324 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall by reason of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this Charter or by rule of the Civil Service Commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.320 of the Charter. Service after January 1, 1951, under limited tenure appointment, by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.320 of this Charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The Civil Service Commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.320 thereof.

The Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approval of the Board of Supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the Board of Supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.320 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the Civil Service Commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding 130 working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond 90 days must be approved by the Civil Service Commission.

Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 130 working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.320 of this Charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.320 of the Charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding 30 working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 30 working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.320 of this Charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointments as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding 130 working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefore shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such 130 working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the Mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the Mayor shall request the supervisors to make supplemental appropriation therefore in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The Civil Service Commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of 12 months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for 12 months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after 12 months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in Section 8.345 for such charges. With respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the sheriff's department the probationary period shall be completed 18 months after the date of hire. Probationary periods of 12 months and up to a maximum of 234 months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the Civil Service Commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the Civil Service Commission shall review the termination. The Civil Service Commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the Civil Service Commission. The commission shall render a decision within 30 days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and or may recommend the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or similar classification under such conditions as the commission shall determine. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the Civil Service Commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Civil Service Commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.
MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote. Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.

Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting October 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Persons who apply for City jobs must take a test to measure their qualifications. Applicants who pass the test are placed on a list ranked from the highest score to the lowest. Ties are broken by lottery. City departments may hire any of the top three persons on the list. This is known as the rule of three. This rule is in the Charter, and the Charter can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would allow any one of the persons with the top three scores on a list to be hired. Under Proposition D ties in test scores would not be broken. This means there could be more than three persons with the top three scores. This is known as the rule of three scores.

Proposition D would give the Civil Service Commission the authority to adopt rules allowing additional qualified applicants on a list to be considered. The Civil Service Commission could adopt such rules only after a process that includes public hearings and meeting and conferring with employee organizations when required. These rule changes would no longer require a change in the Charter.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the City’s hiring process.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
Civil Service Eligibles

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

A major part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, Proposition D revises the "Rule of Three" and in the process will save the City millions of dollars annually by eliminating unnecessary temporary positions.

The "Rule of Three" requires departments to hire from only three names in filling a position. When candidates have identical exam scores, one candidate is arbitrarily ranked above another, using a lottery based on social security numbers.

Because most managers find this too restrictive and too difficult to hire the best qualified person for a job, they often add positions and hire temporary employees who they believe can get the job done. This adds millions of dollars annually to the City’s costs.

Proposition D will end this spending, and in the process, make City government operate more efficiently.

Under Proposition D departments will be able to choose from all candidates with the highest three scores. With tie scores occurring on 25% of exams, departments will have more candidates to choose from.

Other Bay Area cities already allow more candidates to be considered for a job. San Jose uses the number of vacancies plus ten additional names, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties use the seven highest scores.

San Francisco has 1,700 job classifications, more than the Federal government. With these new standards, the Civil Service Commission will create fewer, broader classifications. Proposition D will allow departments to choose from more candidates to find the best person for the job.

Allowing more candidates for a job will expand opportunities for City employees, help departments meet equal opportunity employment goals and reduce the cost of City government.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

It’s true — the Civil Service Commission’s most important job is preventing patronage — too bad they haven’t done so.

The City payroll is more loaded down with political appointments than ever before, even though the Civil Service Commission is supposed to protect the citizenry from employment abuses.

What the politicians and their appointees think of as “red tape” are the very same voter-approved Charter provisions that keep political patronage in check.

Send a message to the City that you would rather have them live within the reasonable Charter rules for hiring than spend time devising end runs around the rules.

Protect merit hiring — tell the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, their commissioners and department heads that you don’t like City employment treated as a private club.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

This proposition opens the door to political patronage.
If you want to give politicians and their appointees power to hand
out jobs, vote for this proposition.
If you want to ensure fair, non-political civil service employ-
ment, VOTE NO ON D.
Buried in verbiage about breaking tie scores is a long-standing
attempt to eliminate Charter-mandated rules that protect fair em-
ployment in City government.
Maybe the City thought voters wouldn’t notice that this proposi-
tion is the same as Prop C. Either measure will take rules regulating
civil service employment out of the Charter and place them in the
hands of politicians and their appointees.
One California city has a “rule of three scores” but department
heads must provide written justification for choosing anyone other
than the top candidate for the job. The result is that 90 percent of
all promotions go to the top candidates — because the reasons for
appointing someone else are almost always political.
Don’t be misled. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Protect
civil service employment from political influence.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains safeguards to ensure fair, non-political
civil service employment. It will help to eliminate the current prac-
tice of adding extra jobs or hiring temporary employees, which
adds millions of dollars to City expenses annually and makes
government work less efficiently.
Prop. D has nothing to do with political appointments or
patronage. Prop. D will provide a better system to select the best
qualified person for an open position, following Civil Service
Rules. Other Bay Area cities don’t have patronage problems when
they choose from more than three qualified candidates. Why should
San Francisco?
Under Proposition D, Civil Service will continue to test appli-
cants and prepare eligible lists. Departments will hire qualified
applicants from these lists, following Civil Service Rules.
The only change made here is that we will eliminate wasteful
spending and broaden opportunities to hire the best individuals to
fill vital City jobs. Given that fact, why would anyone urge you to
maintain the status quo?
Why should San Francisco waste millions of dollars a year to
continue outmoded personnel practices?
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
August 26, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan,
Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Civil Service Eligibles

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

For good government and a fair and efficient personnel system support Proposition D.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition D is part of a civil service reform package of Charter amendments that deserve your Yes vote.

The Charter currently restricts the ability of department heads to fill a job vacancy with the best qualified applicant. Proposition D will allow the Civil Service Commission to give department heads greater discretion when choosing among job applicants. This will assure that our tax dollars are being spent on a qualified workforce that mirrors the diversity of San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

People who get the same scores on civil service tests ought to be treated the same way. Proposition D establishes that basic rule of fair play. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- BROADER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URG R YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition D

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, relating to the certification of eligibles.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this Charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the Civil Service Commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of all those persons meeting the certification rule established for that classification. The Civil Service Commission shall establish certification rules. Certification rules shall not be more restrictive than the certification of all candidates receiving the three highest scores on the list of eligibles for such positions. Of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is protective, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which the certification is to be made there shall be certified to the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended as the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.323 of this charter or or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex; provided however, the appointing officer shall give due consideration to applicable civil service equal employment opportunity (EEO) goals so as to maximize diversity at all levels of city employment. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall annually review each department's performance in meeting its civil service EEO obligations.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, relating to the removal or discharge of permanent employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.341 Dismissal for Cause Removal or Discharge of Permanent, Non-Probationary Employees

A. Any person employed under the civil service provisions of this charter, exclusive of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments as provided under Section 8.343 hereof, in a position defined by the commission as "permanent" may shall be removed or discharged by the appointing officer except for just cause, upon hearing provided with written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and after an opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the appointing officer or his designee. Pending investigation of conduct involving misbehavior, the appointing officer may suspend the person so accused and shall be exonerated if the accusation against the accused person involves misappropriation of public funds or property, misuse or destruction of public property, drug addiction or habitual intemperance, mistreatment of persons, immorality, acts which would constitute a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, or acts which present an immediate danger to the public health and safety. The appointing officer may place the accused person on unpaid administrative leave but such suspension shall not be valid for no more than 30 days unless the charges are made the appointing officer imposes discharge or removal upon such person. When charges are made the appointing officer imposes discharge or removal he or she shall, in writing, notify the person accused removed or discharged of the time and place where the charges will be heard; right to appeal the discharge or removal by mailing such statement to his last known address. The employee shall have thirty days from the date of mailing of the notice to file an appeal of the matter in writing with the appointing officer. Upon receipt of a timely appeal, the hearing appeal shall be conducted forthwith by a qualified and unbiased hearing officer who shall be employed under contract by the city and county and selected by the civil service commission. The hearing officer shall publicly hear and determine charges and, and may approve the discharge or removal, or exonerate, or suspend or the accused.

B. The employee is exonerated the hearing officer may, at his or her discretion, remit the full period of suspension or any portion thereof and may order payment of salary to the employee for the period of suspension or any portion thereof and may order payment of salary to the employee for the period of suspension or any portion thereof and may order payment of salary to the employee for the period of suspension. The discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave, and the report of such period of suspension discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave shall be expunged from the record of service of such employee.

The civil service commission shall immediately be notified of the charges when made, of the action of the appointing officer to remove or discharge, of the hearing appeal, and of the finding thereon. The finding of the hearing officer shall stand final.

The civil service commission may remove or discharge an employee hear and determine for any charge filed by a citizen or by any member of or authorized agent of the commission when the appointing officer neglects or refuses to take such action bring such charge against the employee within 30 days of notification to the department head of the occurrence or event given giving rise to the charge. Removal or discharge may be made for any cause upon the employee is provided with written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and after the employee has had the opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the civil service commission or its designee. The decision of the civil service commission shall be final.

Nothing in this section shall limit or restrict rules adopted by the commission governing dismissal of probationary employees, lay-offs or reduction in force or providing for the removal of any appointee who has abandoned his or her position as defined by civil service commission rules.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a recognized employee organization and any affected city department may agree to alternative procedures, including final and binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator jointly selected by the employee organization and the city, to deal with charges brought against individual employees, the resolution of such charges and the appropriate discipline, if any, to be imposed on the employee. Said alternative procedures shall be included in a Memorandum of Understanding between the city and the employee organization which shall be effective when ratified by the board of supervisors.

C. The effectiveness of this charter amendment is contingent upon the voters' approval at the November 5, 1991 election of an amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter. If the amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter is not adopted at the November 5, 1991 election, then it is the voters' intent that (1) this amendment shall have no force and effect, (2) this amendment shall not become part of the charter, and (3) Section 8.341 shall continue to read as it did immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.

D. Subject to the contingency set forth in Section C above, this charter amendment shall be effective September 1, 1992. Prior to that date, Section 8.341 of this charter shall continue to read as it had immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.

☐
Discharge of
Civil Service Employees

PROPOSITION E
Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City department may fire a permanent employee only after a series of steps. The final step is an appeal to an outside hearing officer. The City may only fire the employee if the hearing officer decides that the department has good reasons for the firing. Generally, the employee remains on the job and the payroll until the hearing officer makes a decision. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee cannot be fired.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment that would allow City departments to fire permanent employees and remove them from the payroll. The employee could then appeal the firing to an outside hearing officer. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee would be returned to work. The hearing officer also could give the employee back pay.

Proposition E also would allow a City department and an employee organization to agree to other procedures for firing employees, including binding arbitration. The Board of Supervisors would have to approve these agreements.

Proposition E would go into effect only if the voters also approve Proposition B, the Collective Bargaining charter amendment.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the way permanent City employees are fired.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to change the way permanent City employees are fired.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application it could accelerate the removal/discharge process for City employees and thereby affect the cost of government in an amount presently indeterminable.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is the last part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package and is estimated to save the taxpayers several millions of dollars a year in unnecessary City costs.

Proposition E will allow the City to remove a fired employee from the payroll after a due process hearing. This is the same procedure used in the private sector and in other public agencies. Currently, an employee fired after a due process hearing remains on the payroll until a second hearing occurs. A hearing officer reviews the firing and then makes a final decision.

LESS THAN 3% OF FIRINGS HAVE BEEN REVERSED ON APPEAL. Yet employees now stay on the payroll, sometimes for months after being fired. Some for over a year. Some then retire with a disability.

Not only is this an unnecessary cost, but the department is delayed in filling these positions so that vital services can be provided to taxpayers.

Under Proposition E, a fired employee still has the right to appeal to a hearing officer. If the hearing officer decides the firing was unjust, the employee will be reinstated with back pay. If the employee is represented by a union, binding arbitration may be substituted for a hearing officer.

Proposition E provides equity as well as needed fiscal reform in these economically troubled times.

In order for Proposition E to take effect, Proposition B, the collective bargaining reform measure appearing on your ballot, must also be approved by the voters.

Your Yes vote on Proposition E will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The current 30-day firing rule is a progressive rule that could well be adopted by industry and other public agencies.

The Charter allows managers to remove incompetent employees from the City payroll for the entire 30 days leading up to the employee actually being fired. If incompetent employees are permitted to stay on the payroll, City management has no one to blame but themselves.

The way the current system works is that the longest an employee can stay on the city payroll after being formally charged is 30 days. The Charter mandates that charges be brought and the firing settled within that time frame.

Under other grievance systems firings can, and do, take months to go through this process — and after the typical long delays and uncertainties, no one is pleased with the results.

Keep the progressive 30-day rule.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

The present system for firing City employees was adopted by the electorate to provide fair, swift dismissal hearings.

Under this system, employees who are about to be fired are suspended without pay for 30-days pending a hearing. Hearing officers then consider the facts and make a ruling before the 30 days run out.

*Proposition E opens the process to long delays with the net result being uncertainty, lost time, money and inefficiency for both employees and the City. Firing could take up to a year or more, instead of 30 days. Justice delayed is justice denied, for all the parties.*

Vote against long delays. Don’t create more costs for the City. For workplace justice and municipal efficiency, keep the 30-day rule. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.**

Citizens Against Political Patronage

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, is designed to modernize the current firing procedures used by Civil Service and save taxpayers money in the process.

The current system allows City employees to remain on the payroll for months — in some cases more than a year after they have been fired. They then remain on the payroll until a second hearing before a hearing officer occurs.

Now, only employees who have committed crimes or are a threat to public safety can be suspended without pay after they are fired. This is less than 10% of the firings.

Since less than 3% of all firings are reversed on appeal, our present system is wasting taxpayers money. Let’s modernize our procedures and save money that could be much better spent.

*Proposition E will not delay the process, it will improve it.*

Since Proposition E will save money, modernize the system, and allow San Francisco to use the standard firing procedures used by the private sector and most other public jurisdictions, why would anyone suggest maintaining the status quo?

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Proposition E protects an employee's right to a hearing while giving the department head the ability to place an employee on unpaid leave. Because most dismissals are upheld by hearing officers, Proposition E will both improve productivity and save money. Should a dismissal not be upheld, the employee would receive back-pay.

Proposition E is fair to city managers, employees and taxpayers. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Even as employees are fired for such serious offenses as sex harassment, discrimination, or theft, our out-of-date rules require us to continue to pay their salaries through several appeals—sometimes a year long. We can't hire good people to replace the bad, and city services suffer. This measure allows us to stop paying them after the first appeal, which is the same as in most workplaces. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- Estimated saving of $20 million to $30 million per year
- More efficient personnel management
- Broader job opportunities for city workers
- Fewer temporary appointments
- More jobs filled on a permanent basis

We urge you to vote for Propositions C, D and E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2

Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party
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PROPOSITION F

Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City employees are military reservists. State law requires the City to pay such employees their full salary for their first 30 days on active duty — except for drills and training. After those 30 days, the City is not allowed to pay employees on active military duty.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow the Board of Supervisors, if requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary, while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances. Employees would receive this benefit only if they are called to active duty for more than 30 days. These additional payments would be limited to 180 days. Payments required under state law would be subtracted from this benefit. Employees released from active duty must return to work for the City within 60 days; otherwise, the benefit would be considered a loan to the employee.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to provide this benefit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to provide this benefit.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. The increase in cost would depend upon the number of employees called to service, the duration of their absence and the differential between their City salary and military pay entitlement.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

Military Reservists

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Last fall 37 employees of the city and county of San Francisco responded to our nation’s call and suddenly found themselves in great danger far from home, family and friends. Many of these men and women were the sole or principal breadwinners in their households. Unfortunately, their bills, debts, rent and mortgages did not cease with their call-up.

In many cases their income dropped by more than 50%!

Many private companies attempted to reduce this hardship by partially or fully compensating their employees for the difference between their military pay and their previous civilian pay for up to six months.

Prop. F does not require the city and county of San Francisco to spend any money! All Prop. F does is to allow the city to consider helping prevent our employees from a devastating financial situation at the very time that they are serving our nation.

One of the most heartening things to come out of Operation Desert Storm was that both those who were for the war, and those who were against it, supported our troops.

While Prop. F sadly is not retroactive and cannot help those Persian Gulf War veterans, it will allow us to assist our men and women in uniform should the need arise again.

Please join us in voting YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F

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

Working people do not declare war. Most people sent to war are working people. Their families deserve to be taken care of, not left to face economic hardship. This measure gives city workers protection against paycheck gaps caused by military call-ups. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, relating to providing workers salary continuation benefits.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, to add subdivision (i) at the end to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

Section 8.400

(i) Notwithstanding any other limitation in the Charter to the contrary, and subject to meet and confer obligations of state law, the Mayor may request that the Board of Supervisors enact, and the Board shall then have the power to so enact, an ordinance entitling City officers or employees called to active duty with a United States military reserve organization to receive from the City the following as part of the individual’s compensation for a period to be specified in the ordinance which may not exceed 180 days, the difference between the amount of the individual’s military pay and the amount the individual would have received as a City officer or employee had the employee worked his or her normal work schedule, including any merit raises which otherwise would have been granted during the time the individual was on active duty. Any such ordinance shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

1. The individual must have been called into active service for a period greater than 30 consecutive days.

2. The purpose for such call to active service shall be extraordinary circumstances and shall not include scheduled training, drills, unit training assemblies, or similar events.

3. The amounts authorized pursuant to such an ordinance shall be offset by amounts required to be paid pursuant to any other law in order that there be no double payments.

4. Any individual receiving compensation pursuant to such an ordinance shall execute an agreement providing that if such individual does not return to City service within 60 days of release from active duty, or if the individual is not fit for employment at that time, within 60 days of return to fitness for employment, then that compensation shall be treated as a loan payable with interest at a rate equal to the greater of (i) the rate received for the concurrent period by the Treasurer’s Pooled Cash Account or (ii) the minimum amount necessary to avoid imputed income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and any successor statute. Such loan shall be payable in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed 5 years, commencing 90 days after the individual’s release from active service or return to fitness for employment, as the case may be.

5. Such an ordinance shall not apply to any active duty served voluntarily after the time that the individual is called to active service.

6. Such ordinance shall not be retroactive.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, relating to the reclassification and status of housing police officers.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.530-3 Transfer of Housing Authority Police to the City and County.

The board of supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall have and is hereby granted power to enter into any agreement with the State of California, or any officer, agency or commission of the State of California, and to pass all necessary legislation and to do or perform any other act or acts deemed necessary to effect the transfer of the employment, jurisdiction and control of the Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority to the city and county. The board of supervisors shall make every reasonable effort to consummate such an agreement no later than July 1, 1984.

Pursuant to said agreement, the city and county shall accept the transfer of all Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority from said Authority. All said Housing Police officers who are transferred to the city and county shall become employees of the City and County of San Francisco under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Police Department.

As of January 1, 1992, Housing Police Officers shall be granted status to the classification of Q2 Police Officers, provided that the individuals comply with each of the state mandated requirements for full peace officer status, and each of the City’s requirements for appointment to the Q2 classification.

Employees granted Q2 Police Officer status under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions of employment as police officers of the City and County of San Francisco, except that said employees shall be entitled to retain members of the Public Employees’ Retirement System of the State of California subject to the approval of the Public Employees’ Retirement System to retain said employees. If the City is unable to obtain the agreement of the Public Employees’ Retirement System to retain those employees who were Housing Police Officers on January 1, 1992, then said employees will be individually offered the choice of Q2 status and pension benefits under Charter section 8.856 as of January 1, 1992 or retention of their current status in all respects.
Housing Authority Police

PROPOSITION G
Shall Housing Authority police officers be allowed to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1983, Housing Authority police officers were transferred from the Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. Because they were not classified as San Francisco police officers, they do not have the same collective bargaining rights. They continue to belong to the State Public Employees’ Retirement System instead of the City’s retirement system. There are 14 Housing Authority police officers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements. They would work under the same terms and conditions as other San Francisco police officers. They could remain in the state Public Employees’ Retirement System if the state approves. If not, each Housing Authority police officer would choose between becoming a San Francisco police officer and joining the City’s retirement system, or continuing as a Housing Authority police officer and staying in the state Public Employees’ Retirement System.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco Police Officers.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted it would allow certain Housing Authority police to gain status as sworn Police Officers. If these officers remain in their existing retirement system, there should be no effect on the cost of government. However, if the officers are enrolled in the regular police retirement plan, there could be an increase in the cost of government, based on current salary and fringe benefit levels, of approximately $20,000 per officer per year.

In my opinion, the maximum annual cost, should all current Housing Authority Officers transition to sworn Police Officers and transfer to the higher retirement cost plan, would be approximately $200,000 per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 62.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Board of Supervisors unanimously supports Proposition G as an equity measure at no significant long-term cost to reclassify no more than twelve former city employees in the official classification of Housing Police Officers to the classification of Q2 Police Officers. The charter amendment corrects a situation which has existed since 1982, when Housing Police officers were transferred from the San Francisco Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. It is recognized that the employees remaining in the former classification are performing substantially similar duties to those performed by San Francisco Police Officers, and if otherwise qualified, they will be granted status to the Police Officer classification as of January 1, 1992. This Charter Amendment is supported by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Police Commission and the Civil Service Commission.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

What the argument put forth by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors fails to mention is the cost of Proposition G to the taxpayers of San Francisco. While the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, Harvey Rose, the respected Budget Analyst for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, whose financial audits have saved San Francisco taxpayers countless millions over the years, states that Proposition G could result in yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262.

Is this expense reasonable just to reclassify Housing Authority police officers who may or may not opt to join the plan? Definitely not. Housing Authority police officers are currently in the state Public Employees Retirement System. This is one of the best retirement systems in the country. There is absolutely no need to reclassify Housing Authority police officers. This measure is imprudent and unnecessary. The San Francisco Taxpayers Association urges you to vote "NO" on Proposition G.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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

We urge a vote against Proposition G, simply because City taxpayers cannot afford it. Although the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, the respected Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, found that it could result in additional yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262 to City taxpayers.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G contains no provisions which impose additional costs to the City. Housing Police Officers are paid at the same rate of pay as Q2 Police Officers. Proposition G would merely change their classification to Q2 Police Officers as an equity measure. Housing Police Officers have always been members of the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and will remain in PERS as long as PERS approves. Should PERS not approve the retention of said employees in PERS, each employee will have two options: retain their Housing Police Officer classification and remain in PERS; or to be reclassified as a Q2 Police Officer and join the San Francisco Retirement System. PERS Board members have stated that they would move to approve maintaining the officers in the PERS system as Q2’s upon passage of the Charter amendment, thus resulting in no cost being imposed on the City.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We, the eleven Housing Police officers affected by Proposition G, tried everything possible to keep the charter amendment a no cost measure.

We informed all City representatives that we intended to remain in the Public Employees' Retirement System and offered to sign any document that would make that binding.

The original draft of this amendment provided language that kept this a no cost measure; but the city attorney insisted on the permissive language which resulted in the possible costs reported in the controller's statement.

We hope you understand our dilemma and ask for your support.

Please vote yes on Proposition G.

Thank you.

Marco DesAngles, Mission Station
Mike Phelan, Mission Station
Carroll Henry, Northern Station
Lou Vance, Northern Station
John Bain, Potrero Station
Arthur Hernandez, Potrero Station
Harvey Josua, Potrero Station
Steve Murphy, Potrero Station
Jamie Ongpin, Potrero Station
Melvin Thornton, Potrero Station
Charles Wilkerson, Potrero Station

These men and women have a tough job and they do it well. They are a big part of our success in restoring the Housing Authority. The risks they take are the same as other police officers, and they ought to be treated equally. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

PROPOSITION H
Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor's Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor's compensation? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Charter makes the Mayor responsible for supervising all departments managed by boards and commissions. The Mayor may hire employees to help carry out this responsibility. Mayors have given their employees various titles, including "Deputy Mayor." Salaries for City employees, including employees in the Mayor's Office, are set by surveying salaries paid by public and private employers in the Bay Area for similar work.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would prohibit the Mayor from assigning a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Proposition H also would prohibit the City from employing for the Mayor a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Under Proposition H, no employee of the Mayor's Office could be paid more than 70% of the Mayor's salary.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed amendment be approved, in my opinion, based on the 1991-92 budget for the Office of the Mayor, a reduction of approximately $28,000 in salary costs could occur.

How "H" Got on the Ballot
On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition H to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 46,720 of the signatures submitted were valid, 6,005 more than the required number of signatures.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Keep Government Clean Committee recommends a "Yes" vote on Proposition H because bloated city government is one of the major symptoms of our city's financial woes. Proposition H gives San Franciscans the opportunity to ban the contrived position of Deputy Mayor once and for all.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION H

The Agnos administration established seven Deputy Mayors with salaries as high as $103,000 per year. Proposition H would prohibit the Mayor from assigning an employee, regardless of title, to supervise any city department already under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer, another elected official and/or boards or commissions.

San Francisco doesn't need highly paid bureaucrats overseeing other bureaucrats whose Charter-given responsibility is to manage city departments. The City Charter clearly states the positions the Mayor can appoint. It says nothing about the appointment of "Deputy Mayors." Yet, the incumbent has simply added bureaucrats and bestowed upon them the sham title of "Deputy Mayor."

According to an April, 1990 analysis by Board of Supervisor Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, the annual cost of the Mayor's office increased $963,477 because of these added expenditures on salaries, pension benefit contributions, health insurance premiums and the like during just the first year of the Agnos administration; that's money which could've been spent on libraries, medical clinics and police and fire protection.

Let's put an end to this wasteful arrogance once and for all. Vote "YES" on H!

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As the independent City Controller has stated, Proposition H only affects three people. It vindictively cuts their salaries approximately $9,000 each. Who are we talking about?

• The City's Director of Finance, who voluntarily gave up a ten year appointment and took a $22,000 pay cut to direct the City's budget team during a difficult year. He was recognized for "Excellence in Fiscal Management" and San Francisco was named among "The Top 15 Cities in America" in Finance World's 1991 edition.

Independent Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, in a August 13, 1991 report states: "The City and County of San Francisco, which has the most complex budget of any county surveyed, has the lowest number of centralized budget staff devoted to the analysis and preparation of the budget."

• San Francisco's first African American Deputy Mayor, a second generation native San Franciscan who was this year voted "Man of the Year" by San Francisco Business and Professional Women, Inc.

• San Francisco's first Asian American Director of the Office of Business and Economic Development. He left a job as a Strategic Planner for the Bank of America to serve the City. He successfully obtained an Enterprise Zone designation from the State, which helps over one-third of San Francisco's businesses.

His leadership in recruiting Pacific Rim business for San Francisco was instrumental in Sister Cities International recognizing San Francisco for "Best Performance of any U.S. City" in 1991.

Proposition H does little to reduce the cost of city government. Please vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

This year as part of city budget reductions, I reduced the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three. That saved $268,000. Because of this change, the City Controller's official estimate is that Proposition H will only save $28,000. It does so in a punitive manner by cutting the salaries of the city's first African American deputy mayor, first Asian American to direct our city's business office, and most unfairly, cuts the salary of the Director of Finance who volunteered to move from the Controller's job paying 30% more.

The supporters of Proposition H have spent more than twice as much money to qualify the measure as it will save.

Every modern Mayor in our city has employed the positions of Deputy Mayor. It signifies an important member of the Mayor's staff who represents him or her throughout the city and elsewhere.

My political opponents should direct their attacks at me, and settle them honorably in the campaign for Mayor, not by rewriting the City Charter. Please join San Francisco Tomorrow and the Democratic Central Committee in opposing Proposition H.

Mayor Art Agnos

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

The Keep Government Clean Committee thanks countless citizens who devoted time and effort to collecting signatures to ensure Proposition H's success particularly Frank Jordan and his campaign volunteers who spent weekend after weekend securing voters' signatures. Their altruistic dedication reflects an abiding desire to keep City Hall honest.

The Mayor's protestations about reducing the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three don't ring true. Neither does his arithmetic. In the first year alone of his seven Deputy Mayors, the cost to taxpayers was over $900,000. Mayor Agnos claims he saved $268,000 by cutting Deputy Mayors from seven to three, and that the Controller estimates Proposition H saves $28,000. But subtracting $268,000 from over $900,000 results in a $632,000 saving from H! During the past 4 years, Agnos' "Deputy Mayor" system has cost taxpayers over $4,000,000. Appointed by the Mayor but a few months ago, the "controlled" Controller forgets that Deputy Mayor titles have merely been altered; such bureaucrats remain, at virtually the same salaries and benefits. The Mayor's "controlled" Controller ignores elimination of positions involving another layer of bureaucracy over Charter-authorized department heads.

The best modern Mayor in our City, George Christopher, never employed a "Deputy Mayor." He followed the Charter, with an appropriate staff which represented him throughout the City, nobly and effectively. "Deputy Mayors," unlike department heads, have no Charter authority! They're not accountable for budgets; they have no lawful power over departmental matters. They're simply overpaid political operatives, whom we can't afford.

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Enough.
At a time when our libraries, swimming pools, and bus routes are being cut back, the Mayor quietly is hiring more and more high-paid political assistants.
Passing this measure is an important step in fighting back.

James Fang, BART Director
Michael Bernick, BART Director

After we began circulating petitions for voters' signatures, Mayor Agnos made cosmetic changes in his seven "Deputy Mayor" positions. While only one "Deputy Mayor" now carries the title, two former "Deputy Mayors" have kept their same salaries, and the others are still around but have been moved and awarded new titles. Elimination of these positions will save approximately $1,000,000 per year. The Mayor will not go without help; in his budget there are 40 positions called "Assistants to the Mayor," earning from $36,452 to $86,684. There are an additional 81 positions in the Mayor's budget, not affected by Proposition H.

When Agnos became Mayor in January, 1987, there were 102 positions in the Mayor's Office at a cost of approximately $3,800,000. Now his office costs approximately $6,100,000 and is staffed by 124 people!

Discounting positions in the Mayor's Office funded from state and federal sources, there were 82 exclusively city-funded positions in the Mayor's Office in 1990, while there were just 21 in San Jose, a larger city. How would you like to be a city department head, accountable under the Charter to a Commission or to the Chief Administrative Officer, but having to answer also to an illegitimate "Deputy Mayor" or some similarly titled person? Can you imagine the state of your morale?

Don't be fooled by the "Agnos shuffle." Vote "YES" on H.

Cheryl Arenson
Dorothy M. Patridge
Martha E. Nilan
Mary A. Lohnais
Irene H. Patridge
Robert Barnes

FOR THE COST OF THESE POLITICAL CRONIES, THINK WHAT WE COULD PROVIDE FOR STUDENTS, LIBRARIES, AND HEALTH CARE. SHAME ON AGNOS!

Rich Bodisco, Chair
S.F. For Reasonable Reform
Rick Fenton, A Concerned Citizen

This caps the fat salaries paid to the mayor's political associates. These patronage jobs violate the public trust.
The mayor could use the same money to hire a dozen physicians to staff my HIV Early Intervention Centers proposal, and care for 10,000 HIV patients. Or staff our neighborhood libraries, keep our streets clean, or (fill-in the blank).
As San Francisco's next mayor, I will clean house and end the big-salary giveaway.

Richard D. Hongisto, Mayoral Candidate

There exists in City Hall a pernicious practice by the Mayor of designating certain extravagantly paid personnel as Deputy Mayors. The City Charter contains no legitimate authorization for any such position, but the Mayor established seven so-called Deputy Mayors, drawing salaries as high as $103,000 per year. With health and other benefits and assistants, there's been a cost to taxpayers of over $1,000,000 annually. That doesn't include overhead. The Grand Jury last year denounced Mayor Agnos' practice and called his office "over-staffed given the population and budget of the city." Its report found that "six of the Deputy Mayors are paid $94,458," one other Deputy Mayor "is paid ... $102,500;" "the Civil Service Commission has not received information detailing the duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Mayors (nor of the 45 Assistants to the Mayor);" and that the Deputy Mayors "are not held accountable for specific operational areas of responsibility ... yet their salaries exceed those of some of the department heads who oversee and are accountable for large budgets and departments;" The Grand Jury additionally discovered: "... the San Francisco Mayor's Office, when compared to Mayor's offices in other combined governments ... has the largest budget, the largest number of employees and pay the highest top salary." Moreover, the Grand Jury certified that "witnesses cited occasions when a Deputy Mayor has put the need to enhance or protect the political image of the Mayor above the needs of the city."

The Mayor has 124 people under his thumb and "Deputy Mayors" duplicate already authorized positions. They're wasteful. The city's limited funds must be used for health, police, fire and other services to San Francisco, not for political patronage. Vote YES on H.

Thomas G. Dempsey
John Riordan
Albert L. Powers
Martha M. Gillham
Daniel G. Gillham
Dorothy L. Powers

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

When the then incumbent left the Mayor's office in 1975 there were 57 people working there. Back then it cost $1,600,000 to run the Mayor's office. Today under Art Agnos there are 124 people in the Mayor's office at a cost to taxpayers of over $6,000,000. Why should there be twice as many people in Room 200 today as there were 16 years ago? And why should the Mayor's office, factoring in inflation, cost over twice as much to run as it did 16 years ago? It shouldn't and that's why a citizen initiative to ban Deputy Mayors collected over 57,000 signatures to put it on the ballot.

Some will argue that because more state and federal money is used to pay for the cost of the Mayor's office that everything is "ok", but that's malarkey as a look at your pay stub shows. Whatever the source the taxpayer is still stuck with a fat bill shows. What is the City receiving for these $100,000 Deputy Mayors? Not much. According to the Grand Jury Report they do political things for Art Agnos. So, let's restore some common sense to City Hall by banning Deputy Mayors.

VOTE "YES" ON "H".

Marian F. Corbett
Dan Dunnigan
Abbie F. Airo

Corrinne Arenson
Clifford J. DaRund
Barbara M. Zerhusen

In January 1990 I initiated a formal review of Mayor Agnos' deputy mayor system. Since then, our Budget Analyst and Civil Grand Jury have found that the deputy mayor system is a bloated, inefficient way of doing business.
I urge you to vote for Proposition H so we can restore accountability to the Mayor's office. Fancy titles and huge salaries only create the illusion of leadership. San Franciscans deserve better than that!
Vote yes on Proposition H!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The purpose of Proposition H is to end the sorry spectacle of the creation by ANY MAYOR of bureaucrats with fancy titles, such as "Deputy Mayor." The best Mayor in modern San Francisco history, George Christopher, never had a Deputy Mayor. He obeyed the Charter, appointing people only to those positions authorized by it. In the Alioto administration, one person arrogated to himself the title of "Deputy Mayor". People laughed about it on the then Board of Supervisors, never thinking it was a serious effort to destroy the Charter or cost taxpayers unjustified money, particularly because that individual occupied the Charter-authorized position of "Executive Deputy". Thereafter, however, the illegitimate practice increased through the next two administrations, reaching a climax with the current mayor, who within a year of taking office, created seven (7) "Deputy Mayor" positions, with ultimate salaries of over $100,000 plus fringe benefits and immense associated additional costs to taxpayers. Sensing that this voter initiative would qualify for the ballot, this Mayor now tries to distract voters by claiming abolition of the positions. While the titles have been changed, the employees remain, at virtually the same salaries and auxiliary costs. As shown by the Budget Analyst's review of the current City budget, the seven "Deputy Mayors" have been hidden under different names in City Hall crevices. Proposition H uproots and disposes of them, at a resultant savings of approximately $1,000,000 per year to taxpayers. Don't be fooled by the "shell game"; vote YES on H.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

The Agnos system of seven deputy mayors — now with new titles, but still averaging nearly $100,000 a year — is a waste of your money.
An effective mayor controls the heads of each department, so why should the mayor need expensive deputy mayors to manage his own department heads?
There will be only one chief of staff in an Alioto administration. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

We believe that the Mayor is elected to manage and staff the Mayor's office as he or she sees fit. The Mayor needs management flexibility to solve the City's complex problems. If we do not like the way the City is run, we must elect new officials, not tie the hands of government.

Vote NO on Proposition H!

Andy Nash
Peter Moylan
Charlene Clarke
Norm Rofe
Bernie Choden
Jack Morrison
San Francisco Tomorrow

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

BAN DEPUTY MAYORS
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER
SECTION 3.100 BY ADDING NEW SECTIONS 3.100-3
BANNING APPOINTMENTS TO THE POSITION OF DEPUTY TO THE MAYOR OR TO POSITIONS KNOWN AS DEPUTY MAYOR.

NOTE: This entire section is new.

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

San Francisco Charter Section 3.100 is amended and modified by adding Section 3.100-3 reading as follows:

Section 3.100-3 Prohibiting Deputy Mayors.

Notwithstanding any other provisions or limitations of this charter to the contrary, the mayor may not designate nor may the city and county employ on the mayor's behalf any person to act as deputy to the mayor or any similar employment classification, regardless of title, whose responsibilities include but are not necessarily limited to supervision of the administration of any department for which the chief administrative officer, an elected official other than the mayor or an appointed board or commission is assigned responsibility elsewhere in this charter; nor may any employee in the office of the mayor be compensated at a level in excess of seventy percent of the compensation paid to the mayor under the salary standardization provisions of this charter.

This section shall take effect on the first day of January of the year following its approval by the voters of the city and county.
PROPOSITION I
Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?

YES  
NO  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City wants to include people under 18 on certain boards, commissions and advisory bodies. At this time, you must be a San Francisco resident and an elector to be appointed to any of these groups. To be an elector, you must be at least 18 years old and eligible to register to vote.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments. Persons under 18 when appointed would be required to become electors when they reached 18.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow persons under 18 to be appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body when the law creating that body provides for such appointments.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the requirement that persons appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body be 18 or older.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On July 22, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This Charter Amendment would allow young people under 18 to serve on boards, commissions and advisory bodies when the Board of Supervisors has specifically provided for their participation. Currently San Francisco youth under 18 are excluded from participating on the advisory boards and commissions which forge policies for our youth in San Francisco.

The Delinquency Prevention Commission, for example, currently provides two seats for youth under 18. These seats are unfilled because of the Charter requirement that members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies must be electors.

In order for the City to address the changing needs and realities of young people, it is important that San Francisco amend its policy and adopt a system in which the voices of young people are an integral part of decisions which affect their lives and future. Surely there is no more effective voice for the youth than youth.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The argument of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor for this measure cleverly ignores the point: they ask us to amend our Charter to create a fiction, namely, that people under 18 are electors, when they legally are not. They do so under the guise of eligibility for membership on a board or commission. It used to be that you had to be a voter to participate in policy decisions of boards or commissions of city government. In fact, it still is. That's what the Charter requires and for good reason. Commissioners are accountable; they exercise legal responsibility. That's why the law requires them to be electors. Proposition I resembles that line in "Alice in Wonderland" where Tweedledee explains to Alice: "If it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic."

We urge you to reject a legallyistically contrived ballot measure by voting "NO" on Proposition I.

Kopp's Good Government Committee

Quentin L. Kopp

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

While this proposal seems well intentioned, it is nonsensical public policy to treat minors as electors (when they are not) so as to serve as city commissioners.

There surely are enough well qualified electors who are willing and able to serve on city boards and commissions without drafting minors to do so. While we wholeheartedly support the concept of encouraging teenagers to be involved in governmental issues, it is a fiction to call them electors so they can be given the awesome responsibility of a commissioner. We should listen to their thoughts and ideas, but people under 18 should not be placed in a contrived position as electors to formulate public policy. Common sense urges that you vote NO on Proposition I.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The issue raised by Proposition I is not the availability of qualified electors but fairness in government. Proposition I does not declare teenagers to be electors. Rather it provides that on certain governmental bodies young people should have a voice. The only body presently so constituted is the Delinquency Prevention Commission.

Placing young people in positions of leadership is not contrived. It is a respectful and practical approach to public policy and a recognition that age and wisdom are not mutually exclusive.

This legislation would have no application to the powerful boards and commissions created under the Charter. It would only apply to governmental bodies created by the Board of Supervisors where participation by persons under 18 is expressly deemed helpful to the City as well as to its young people.

This is a good government issue.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Our youth have the intelligence and ability to help shape public policy on the issues that affect their lives. Boards and commissions that determine how the City reaches out to help our youth must have input from the youth themselves in order to have any chance of success.

Join me in voting YES on Proposition I.

*Supervisor Angela Alioto*

Voices of young people should be heard in City Hall. Too often adults do all of the talking and none of the listening. This measure allows young people to be appointed to those positions that have been designated for them — but which can’t be filled now because of a Catch-22 in the Charter. This fixes that. Vote “yes”.

*Mayor Art Agnos*

---

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof, providing that minors may be appointed by the board of supervisors to boards, commissions or advisory bodies created by legislation of the board of supervisors if the legislation allows the appointment of minors to the board, commission or advisory body.

The Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county and an elector thereof immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, if a board, commission or advisory body is established by a legislative act which provides that any member or members of the board, commission or advisory body may be under the age of 18 years, then appointees to serve on the board, commission or advisory body in positions in which the original legislative act allows persons under the age of 18 to serve shall be residents, but need not be electors until they have attained the age of 18. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Children's Fund

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City be required to create a Children's Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for services for children is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on services for children.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment. For 10 years, the City would be required to place a certain part of its property tax revenues in a Children's Fund. This Fund would pay for additional services for children under 18. In the first year, the amount would be 1-1/4 cents for each $100 of assessed property value; for the next 9 years the portion would be 2-1/2 cents.

The Fund could only be spent on children's services as follows: child care, job readiness, training and placement programs, social services (including prenatal services to pregnant adult women), educational programs, recreation, delinquency prevention and library services. For the first 4 years, at least 25% of the Fund would be used for childcare, at least 25% for job training and placement, and at least 25% for health and social services. Beginning with the fifth year, the Board of Supervisors could change or eliminate these minimums.

The measure prohibits using the Fund for certain purposes, including services which benefit children only indirectly. The City would be prohibited from reducing spending for children's services below what it spent in 1990-91 or 1991-92, whichever is higher. Money in the Fund could be used only to increase spending for children's services.

Each year, after public hearings, the Mayor would send to the Board of Supervisors a Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to place a certain amount of the City's property tax revenues in a Fund to provide additional services for children under 18.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this Fund.
Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand specific children's services as set forth in the measure, mandate the current level of spending on children's services with prescribed escalation factors, and require certain administrative tasks to be done by various boards, commissions and the Controller.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to children's programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures. In addition, since this initiative prohibits the use of these funds for the operations and maintenance of recreation & park, library and hospital facilities, even if used for expanded children's programs, supplementary general fund monies may be required to support these expanded programs.

Based on 1991-92 budgets and property tax assessments, approximately $5.7 million in 1992-93, $13.2 million in 1993-94, and $14.0 million in 1994-95, and increasing thereafter with the rate of increase in assessed values of city properties until 2001-2002, would be reallocated by this measure.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition J to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot. 40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 51,140 of the signatures were valid, 10,425 more than the required number of signatures.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The condition of children in San Francisco — all children, of all colors and all economic classes — is deteriorating, sometimes to crisis proportions.

The crisis is inhumane and expensive. Lives are being destroyed. All our futures are in jeopardy, even though prevention is less costly and more effective than trying to repair broken lives.

Proposition J, The Children's Amendment, is the result of three year's work by 60 child-serving agencies, The Children's Budget Coalition — many of which are not funded in any way by city funds.

Year after year, Coalition members watched the children's percentage of the City budget decline. They concluded that:

Without special protections, children will continue to be victims in the annual budget wars conducted by adults.

Children can't vote, lobby or contribute to political campaigns. As a result their needs are often ignored.

Proposition J requires that special protections for children be written into the City Charter — as Child Labor laws have written special protections into state and federal law. It provides a minimum guarantee for funding for children's programs; a minimum guarantee for prevention and enrichment, rather than abuse, unemployment, prison and disease.

The Children's Fund, created by Proposition J, would only constitute approximately .5% (one half of one percent) of the total city budget.

Proposition J makes significant improvements without new taxes or bureaucracies, by re-ordering city priorities and coordinating services provided by a dozen city departments.

Because children are the next generation, Proposition J is a guarantee for the future of us all.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR CHILDREN. VOTE FOR THE FUTURE. VOTE FOR OURSELVES.

Margaret Brodkin, Director
Greg Day, President
Jean Jacobs, Founder
Coleman Advocates for Children

Yori Wada, Board of Regents, U.C.*
Michael Shaw, Black Leadership Forum*

Art Tapia, Sergeant, SFPD*, Chair
Alicia Wang, Treasurer
Children's Amendment Campaign

* For identification only

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is not as simple or easy as its sponsors say. While not disputing the validity of their contentions about children's problems, other groups in San Francisco have major problems, including the elderly, the mentally ill, the physically disabled, the unemployed, the sick and infirm, Muni Railway riders, blighted neighborhoods. Proposition J is a flawed, simplistic way to address children's problems. It limits the discretion of elected representatives to expend General Fund revenues and affects seriously the city's ability to balance future budgets by reducing available tax dollars. Like to the Open Space Fund, it diverts property tax collections for one group at the expense of others. What group will be next to obtain the same diversion of property tax collections? Its robbing Peter to pay Paul. A pending state measure would provide substantial additional money for the General Fund and children's services, by conforming state tax codes to Proposition 13 requirements and reappraising large-corporation property in San Francisco upon changes in majority stock ownership. That creates more money for children's services in San Francisco, without taking money from police, fire, health, library or elderly services.

Finally, the money Proposition J diverts from property tax collections will soon be all that city government allocates to children's services. The "minimum guarantee" mentioned by the sponsors will become the maximum, like the lottery for education. That's human nature. I don't want the "floor" to be the "ceiling" and that's why I'm voting "NO" on "J".

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is another seductive, but deleterious, concept, fostered specially for a particular segment of society. Who can argue against providing money for the needs of children? Obviously, we love our children and want to aid them as necessary. But, Proposition J is not the way to do it. It is a fiscal "gimmick", which takes two and one-half cents per $100 assessed property valuation and sequesters it in a special fund. It raises no extra money for children's services; it reduces the amount of money which might be needed more from time to time for the elderly, for hospital and library facilities and recreation and parks.

Already, San Francisco's budget has been adversely affected for nearly 17 years by diversion of property tax revenue to remove private property from the tax rolls for "open space". This measure includes escalation factors which would divert $13,200,000 from the General Fund by 1993, and thereafter divert an increasing sum at a rate of approximately 9% per year. Proposition J mandates services without providing a realistic method of paying. Earmarking a fixed percentage of the City budget for any purpose is terrible public policy. Meeting its requirements will inevitably cause cuts in other services like law enforcement and health care for the elderly. If this passes, effective governance by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors will become even more excruciatingly difficult. That's why I'm voting against Proposition J, even if other elected public officials in San Francisco won't admit they'd like to tell you to do so also. Vote "NO" on J.

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Protecting children is not a "gimmick." There is no gimmickry in being able to say "yes" to mothers needing childcare so they can return to work, or "yes" to teenagers needing special training to get jobs.

Opponents to J object to "diverting" a tiny percent of the city budget (.5%) to children. They want to continue the politics-as-usual budget process. That process has utterly failed children. Failed to provide even the most basic services — like immunizations from disease, safe after-school programs, and adequate library books. Children cannot cut budget "deals" to get their fair share. They are the one group for whom special budget protections are essential.

Spending an additional one-half of 1% of the budget on children will not prevent San Francisco from meeting other critical needs. It saves money to invest in developing a law-abiding, healthy, qualified younger generation. How could proponents of greater efficiency in government argue that such efficiency is not possible when it comes to finding funds for our children?

The Children's Fund will only increase at the same rate as city revenues. The so-called "escalating factor" merely controls for inflation.

San Franciscans have understood the unique vulnerability of children. They have not been swayed by divisive rhetoric that pits one group against another. Read the arguments that follow. Seniors, police officers, law enforcement officials, gay and lesbian leaders, environmentalists and members of every neighborhood all agree: Protecting children is enlightened, farsighted public policy.

Yori Wada
Michael Shaw
Jean Jacobs
Art Tapia

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Children's Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

It is undeniable that children's services are underfunded. The ongoing financial cutbacks from the state and federal government threaten to aggravate the situation.

Because children cannot vote, the electorate must insulate children's services from the political process. The Children's Amendment will protect children's programs and guarantee that children remain a top priority no matter who is in office.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Children deserve a special place in the city's budget. Legally they can't vote or speak for themselves. This measure gives them the claim on city funds that they need. I have analyzed our city funds and am confident we can deliver what Proposition J asked for without hurting other people. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

In 1989, I introduced legislation to create a Children's Budget for San Francisco, but the mayor refused to allocate the money. Now, the mayor is jumping on the bandwagon, but it is not enough to care about children only in an election year.

I have fought every year for budgeting that starts with the neediest: our children.

Twenty-three percent of our children under five live in poverty. We need better health services for children, more day care options, job training and programs for abused children. These must be our top priority.

Vote YES on Proposition J.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

I am proud to have been the first public official to endorse the Children's Amendment.

As former sheriff, I understand the need for prevention services to reach out to our young people. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors, it's clear to me that children cannot compete with the special interests that dominate City budget debates.

Our children are shortchanged. Proposition J is a necessary framework to end this injustice, and care for our children. As a parent, as a children's advocate, I respectfully urge your vote for Proposition J.

Richard D. Honigstö
Mayoral Candidate

In the politics-as-usual process of the San Francisco city budget, children are especially vulnerable. They are too small to hire lobbyists, make campaign contributions, and cut deals.

Now, San Francisco's children are in the midst of a worsening crisis: child abuse in San Francisco is up 400% over the last ten years; there are 8,000 kids on the waiting list for child-care; 23% of all mothers in San Francisco have poor and inadequate pre-natal care.

We support Proposition J, to amend the San Francisco Charter to provide a minimum guarantee for funding children's programs.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Evelyn Wilson, Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee
Jennifer Clary, Richmond District Democratic Club
Dorice Murphy, President, Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Joe O'Donoghue, President, SF Residential Builders Association
Sue Hestor
Carol Kocivar
Calvin Welch
Dennis Antenore
"Ramona" Albright, Twin Peaks Council & Open Space Conservancy*
Gene Coleman
"Irish" Pat Lawlor

* For identification purposes only

Proposition J is good government and sound fiscal policy.

Proposition J does not raise taxes. It creates a Children's Fund by utilizing existing resources. It requires the city to reallocate approximately one percent of the city's General Fund, less than half of one percent of the overall city budget, to children's services.

This can be done without reducing other city services if the city government would allocate and expend funds with greater efficiency. The Children's Amendment will be one more pressure point on the city to improve its financial management, and the children of the city will benefit.

Setting aside a portion of the budget to meet critical needs is standard budget practice. It is already done for the arts, for seniors and for open space purchases, to name a few. It certainly makes sense to provide a similar guarantee for our children.

Investing in children is the wisest investment the city can make, one of the best possible uses of public revenues.

Victor Honig, CPA
Roland Quan, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S CHILDREN FACE A SERIOUS CRISIS:

- Children on waiting list for day-care — 8,000
- Child Abuse — UP 400%, 1980 – 1990
- Children without health coverage — UP 300% 1985 – 1990
- Homeless children and youth — 5,000 each year
- Mothers without adequate pre-natal care — 23%
- High School dropouts — 1,500 per year

*Proposition J, The Children’s Amendment, will continue existing programs, and, with no new taxes, provide enough money to:
  - Provide childcare for 1,000 additional children;
  - Establish mental health and family support centers to prevent child abuse;
  - Provide pre-natal care for all expectant mothers currently without care;
  - Bring library purchases of children’s books up to the same level as Oakland, and expand library hours for children;
  - Provide jobs and job training for 1,500 youths;
  - Provide after-school recreation programs, tutoring programs, AIDS prevention, school-based health-care and more.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Asian Childcare Coalition
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Ctr
Booker T. Washington Center
Camp Fire Boys/Girls
Catholic Charities, SF
Catholic Youth Organization
Central City Hospitality House
Children’s Council/Childcare Switchboard
Children’s Law Offices
Children Now
Children’s Self-Help Center
Coleman Advocates
Family School

Family Service Agency, SF
Gay/Lesbian Youth Advocates
Grandparents Who Care
Haight-Ashbury Play Program
Income Rights Project
Japanese Community Youth Council
Jewish Family/Children’s Services
La Casa de las Madres
Legal Services for Children
Maternal Child/Adolescent Health Board
Mission Reading Clinic
Morrisonia West
Mothers/Fathers of Concern
Omega Boys Club
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
SF Association for Education of Young Children
SF Boys/Girls Club
SF Child Abuse Council
SF Headstart (Far West Laboratory)
SF Parents Lobby
SF PTA
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Visitation Valley Community Center
Visitation Valley Parents for Youth
Wu Yee Children’s Services
Young Community Developers
Youth Advocates/Huckleberry House
Youth Employment Coalition
Youth Law Center
YWCA

The best way to reduce crime is to prevent it. Taking care of our children is the smartest, most cost-effective way to keep our youth out of the criminal justice system. That’s why we as police officers urge you to vote yes on The Children’s Amendment.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Every day, we deal with the tragic human and financial costs of failing to take preventative action to help the City's children live safe, honest and productive lives.

The City currently pays over $30,000 a year to keep a juvenile in a correctional facility — in addition to the cost to the public of his/her crimes or misdemeanors. It would cost only $2,800 a year to provide both job training and after school recreation.

The City currently pays $2,000 a day for neo-natal intensive care for crack babies. It would cost only $125 a day to provide a drug program for a pregnant teenager.

The City currently pays $15,000 a year to keep an abused or neglected child in a foster home. It would cost only $3,000 a year to provide a family with comprehensive mental health and support services.

We believe it is both humane and economical to pay now for health-care, child-care and youth training, rather than pay later for welfare, psychiatric hospitals and prisons.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender

We are committed to the education of San Francisco's children and we believe The Children's Amendment will greatly enhance our ability to educate our children. Since Proposition 13, our public schools have had to cut sports, social workers, nurses, libraries, childcare, vocational services and after-school programs.

The Children's Amendment will help the schools by providing funding for many of the services the school district desperately needs, but can no longer afford to support.

Tom Ammiano
Carlota del Portillo
Libby Denebeim
Dan Kelly
Joanne Miller
Fred Rodriguez
Leland Yee
Members, SF Board of Education
Members, SF Community College Board

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala
Robert Burton
William Marquis, Ph.D.
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Tim Wolfred, Ph.D.
Robert Varni

Ramon Cortines, Superintendent, SFUSD
Evan Dobelle, EdD, Chancellor, SF Community College
Diana Schindler, President, SF PTA
Jill Wynns, President, SF Parents' Lobby

San Francisco's children live in the shadows of some of the world's most renowned and advanced medical institutions. Yet, the overall health status of our children is appalling. Almost half of our two-year-olds are not adequately immunized; a quarter of our pregnant mothers do not get adequate prenatal care; and our adolescents have one of the highest rates of sexually transmitted disease in the country. The number of children hospitalized at the state psychiatric facility has tripled in the past ten years. The Children's Amendment will enable San Francisco to more effectively reach out to our children with appropriate care, care that will keep our children strong and healthy and able to lead productive lives.

Abraham Rudolph, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, UCSF*
Philip Zeiring, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics/Pacific Campus, California Pacific Medical Center
Moses Grossman, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, UCSF
Martin Gershman, M.D., Chairman, California District of American Academy of Pediatrics
Paul Kulp, R.N., M.S., Golden Gate Nurses Association
Anita De Frantz, Ph.D., Maternal Child & Adolescent Health Board

*For identification purposes only

Ensuring minimum funding for City services is a desperate measure, but these are desperate times.

In the 1991-1992 budget, the Mayor and Supervisors raised MUNI fares and residential parking fees and slashed vital health and safety services while rewarding real estate speculators and out-of-town corporations and preserving pork-barrel "perks" like luxury Candlestick boxes for the politically connected.

Such regressive policies are expected, coming out of Washington and Sacramento, but when they are adopted by our own leaders, the voters must take a stand to preserve our most important resource, our children.

After all, who do these politicians expect to pay the taxes to support their salaries in the 21st Century if we fail to educate our young people to compete in the global economy. The Germans and Japanese? Robots?

Vote YES on Proposition J!

North Mission Association
David Spero, President
Brian Doohan
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We in the African American community are concerned about the disproportionate harmful impact on our community that results from the lack of a preventative focus in public policy. It is unconscionable that African Americans have the highest infant mortality rate and the largest representation in both the foster care and the juvenile justice systems. It is unacceptable for mothers who want to work to be unable to find affordable childcare.

Proposition J is the beginning of what we feel is a rational approach to addressing some of the unmet health, childcare and employment needs in our community.

Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Doris Ward
Dr. Amos Brown, Third Baptist Church
Reverend Cecil Williams, Glide Memorial Church
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Sharen Hewitt, Coalition for an African American Community Agenda
Anita De Frantz, Ph.D., National Black Child Development Institute
Lulanne McGiff, NAACP, San Francisco
Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
George Newkirk
Michael Shaw, Taxpayer
Ronald Colthirst, Office of Assemblyman John Burton
Espanola Jackson, District 7 Democratic Club

The most vital members of our families and our community are our children. They need special treatment and protection. We support The Children’s Amendment because we believe children need the special protection of guaranteed minimum funding for children's programs.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Richard Sanchez, MD, Health Commissioner*
James Morales, Planning Commission*
Roberto Hernandez, Recreation & Park Commissioner*
Robert Sanchez, Small Business Commissioner*
Robert Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co.*
Edward Farrah, Business Executive
Mike Garza, Businessman
Maria Acosta Colon, Director, Mexican Museum
Rene de la Rosa, KIPI

*For identification purposes only

The Children’s Amendment is good business. Money spent on having healthy, educated productive children is not an expense. It is the best investment this city can make. As leaders of the business community, we know that the economic security of this country is in jeopardy because too many of our children are not prepared to enter the labor market. The Children’s Amendment will fund critical job training programs for our youth. This training will allow our youth to move into the workforce, where they will be productive and pay taxes, rather than become dependent. Businesses have to be competitive if the U.S. economy is to stay healthy . . . and businesses need to be vigilant about controlling costs if they are to be competitive. But nowhere in that equation can we forget our responsibility — individual and institution alike — to our children.

For the sake of our future, support The Children’s Amendment.

Elliot Hoffman, Just Desserts
Louis Giraudo, Chairman & CEO, SF French Bread Co.
Stanley Herstein, Chairman, World Trade Center of SF
Terese Dicks Payne, Senior Managing Director, Bear Stearns
Sue Danielson, Small Business Commission
Russell Kasman, Small Business Commission, Owner —Kasman Piano
Jerome Dodson, The Parnassas Fund
Edward Farrah, School Apparel, Inc.
Roberto Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co.*
Lawrence Simi, Businessman

Change the world of a child, and you change the world. As elected officials, we know that children often get the short end of the stick because they lack political clout. Children need the kind of special protection afforded to them by Proposition J. The Children’s Amendment. Kids can’t vote, but you can!

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J.

John Burton, Member of State Assembly
Senator Milton Marks
Nancy Pelosi, Member of Congress
Jackie Speier, Member of State Assembly
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Because they can't vote San Francisco's children do poorly each year in our city's budget process. Our lesbian, gay and bisexual youth lack basic support services and are at great risk of suicide, violence, AIDS, dropping out of school and becoming homeless 'throwaways.' The Children's Amendment will preserve minimum funding for all children and provide funding for new programs that could be used to help our youth and other underserved children.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Harry Britt
Tom Ammiano, Board of Education
Tim Wolfred, College Board
Gay & Lesbian Youth Advocates
Lavender Youth Recreation & Information Center
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Richard Allman
T.J. Anthony
Robert Barnes
Ray Benson
Paul Boneberg
Mike Bostia
Barbara Cameron
Eric Ciasullo
Greg Day
Mary Dunlap
Roma Guy
Jean Harris

Ken Jones
Hoover Lee
Phyllis Lyon
Del Martin
Paul Melbostad
Brandy Moore
Pat Norman
Donna Ozawa
Melinda Paras
Diana Phillips
Maggi Rubenstein
Chris Sandoval
Thomas Steel
Judith E. Stevenson and
Lily Gee Hickman
K.Tsenin
Carmen Vasquez
John Wilhite
Reggie Williams
Hank Wilson
Lawrence Wong
Richmond Young

Childern are everyone's future. If we fail to invest in our children now, both their future and ours may well be troubled, expensive, and unproductive. The Children's Amendment will require city government to make children, to make the future, a priority.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition J.

Douglas Chan, President, Lawrence Wong, Vice President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Vincent Chao, School Principal
Claudine Cheng, National President, Organization of Chinese Americans*
Dr. Youn Chey, Executive Director, Korean Multi-Services Center*
Victor Hsi
Ray Ibay, SFPD*
Hoover Lee
Jeff Mori, Community Youth Council
Sulalagi Paleka, Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club
Rodel E. Rodis, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, President, SF Community College Governing Board
Noafaluma Tuisasopo, Samoa Mo Samoa
Vu-Duc Vuong, Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Alan Wong
Harold Yee, President, Asian Inc.
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Children's Services

*For identification purposes only

As environmentalists we support The Children's Amendment to protect our most important natural resource — the children. Ecology issues are human issues. We can't protect future generations, if we don't save the very next generation, today's children.

Green Party of California
San Francisco Tomorrow

We cannot live and work for a better future and, at the same time, neglect our children. Our children are the future, and without our efforts now, our future may be both bitter and bleak. As US Senator Daniel Moynihan has warned us:

"The US today may be the first society in history where the children are much worse off than adults."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR THE FUTURE.

Robert Morales, Teamsters, Local 350
United Educators of San Francisco
SEIU, Local 535 — Social Services Union
Shirley Black
Michael Hardeman, Labor Leader
Upholstery Division, Local 3-U, USWA
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Eight thousand children are currently on waiting lists for childcare in San Francisco.

Twenty-three percent of all expectant mothers receive poor or inadequate pre-natal care.

Every day, 1,800 women and children are fed from soup lines at Glide Memorial Church and St. Anthony's Dining Room.

Child abuse is San Francisco has risen over 400% in the last five years.

Proposition J, The Children's Amendment, will provide increased child-care, increased pre-natal care, family mental health and support centers, expanded library and after-school recreation programs.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

San Francisco Chapter, National Organization for Women
Bay Area Women's Resource Center

We can truly be a voice for the voiceless right here in our own City if we support The Children's Amendment. We now have a whole generation of children we have failed. The Children's Amendment will help make the City become a loving involved mother to all of its children. Help make San Francisco child-friendly. All families benefit from better recreation centers, child-care centers, libraries, health-care and social services.

Vote yes on Proposition J.

George Wesolek, Executive Director, Justice & Peace
Commission, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Sister Glenn Anne McPhee, Office of Catholic Schools,
Archdiocese of San Francisco
Catholic Charities of San Francisco
Catholic Youth Organization

The most important obligation of each generation is to see that the next generation is prepared to carry on in its place. Vote to protect our future San Franciscans.

VOTE FOR THE CHILDREN'S AMENDMENT, PROPOSITION J.

Grandparents Who Care
Gray Panthers of San Francisco
Senior Action Network

A society cannot survive if it does not provide care for its children. The San Francisco Democratic Party urges all San Franciscans of every party to provide for the future now by supporting our children and grandchildren this November.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Berman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Kimiko Burton, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lula Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Ellen Chaitin, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Michael Hardeman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
John Figone, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steven Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicea Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Chair of the Finance Committee, I am fully aware of the city’s fiscal problems. But I am also a parent, a former teacher, and I am deeply committed to making San Francisco an excellent place to raise children.

The budget situation for San Francisco will be difficult next year, but after that, it is projected to improve: state and federal funds are forthcoming to address law enforcement and healthcare needs and we can continue to cut bureaucratic costs. Finding an additional .5% of the general fund budget for children will not be easy, but it can be done.

FOR CHILDREN’S SAKE, VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J provides no answers to any funding problems that affect San Francisco’s children; it makes yearly budgeting even more difficult.

Vote “NO” on Proposition J

This measure would skim “from the top” 2-1/2% of the revenues from property taxes for the next ten years. The earmarking of public funds is shortsighted public policy because it deprives our public officials of the ability to adapt revenues to the ever-changing needs of the city. The money that would fund children’s programs cannot be reallocated in the future for other critical services such as law enforcement, health care for the elderly, AIDS, mental health and other basic programs.

On the face of it this may sound like a great idea, but the reality is that Proposition J provides no extra money to San Francisco’s coffers to address the diverse needs of our city.

Let’s not make promises we can’t keep. Vote “NO” on Proposition J.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp
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NOTE: This entire section is new.

San Francisco Charter Section 6.415

6.415 Children's Fund

(a) There is hereby established a fund to expand children's services, which shall be called the San Francisco Children's Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used solely to expand services for children as provided in this section.

(b) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Children's Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to Section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of one-and-one-quarter cents ($0.0125) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for the first fiscal year in which begins ninety days or more after the election which approves this section, and revenues equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the following nine fiscal years. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts 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 limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter for the purposes specified in this section.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used exclusively to provide services to children less than eighteen years old, above and beyond services funded prior to adoption of this section. To this end, monies from the fund shall not be appropriated or expended to fund services provided during fiscal year 1991-1992, whether or not the cost of such services increases, or appropriated or expended for services which substitute for or replace services provided during fiscal year 1990-1991 or 1991-1992, except and solely to the extent of services for which the City ceases to receive federal, state, or private agency funds which the funding agency required to be spent only on the services in question.

(d) Services for children eligible for fund assistance shall include only child care, job readiness, training and placement programs; health and social services (including pre-natal services to pregnant adult women); educational programs; recreation; delinquency prevention; and library services, in each case for children. Services for children paid for by the fund shall not include:

1. For example and not for purposes of limitation, services provided by the police department or other law enforcement agencies; by courts, the district attorney, public defender or city attorney; by the fire department; detention or probation services mandated by state or federal law; or public transportation;

2. Any service which benefits children incidentally or as members of a larger population including adults;

3. Any service for which a fixed or minimum level of expenditure is mandated by state or federal law, to the extent of the fixed or minimum level of expenditure;

4. Acquisition of any capital item not for primary and direct use by children;

5. Acquisition (other than by lease for a term of ten years or less) of any real property; or

6. Maintenance, utilities or any similar operating cost of any facility not used primarily and directly by children, or of any recreation or park facility (including a zoo), library facility or hospital.

(e) During each fiscal year, a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) of said fund shall be used for child care, a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) for job readiness, training and placement and a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) for health and social services for children (including pre-natal services for pregnant adult women). Beginning with the fifth fiscal year during which funds are set aside under this section, the Board of Supervisors may modify or eliminate these minimum requirements.

(f) Not later than three months after the election which approves this section and not later than December of each calendar year which begins after said election, the Mayor shall prepare and present to the Board of Supervisors a Children's Services Plan. The plan shall propose goals and objectives for the fund for the fiscal year beginning the following July 1, propose expenditures of monies from the fund for the fiscal year beginning the following July 1 and designate the city departments which would administer the funded programs. In connection with preparation of the Children's Services Plan, and (except in connection with the first Children's Services Plan) prior to the date required for presentation to the Board, the Health Commission, Juvenile Probation Commission, Social Services Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission and Public Library Commission shall each hold at least one public hearing on the Plan. Joint hearings may be held to satisfy this requirement. Any or all of the commissions may also hold additional hearings before or after presentation of the Plan.

(g) The fund shall be used exclusively to increase the aggregate City Appropriations and expenditures for those services for children which are eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law). To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of such City Appropriations for eligible services (not including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund and exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law) in any of the ten years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the higher of the amount so appropriated for the fiscal year 1990-1991 or the amount so appropriated for the fiscal year 1991-1992, in either case as adjusted. Not later than three months after the election which approves this section, the Controller shall calculate and publish the applicable base amount, specifying by department and program each amount included in the base amount. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each year after the base year, based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City Appropriations from the base year, as estimated by the Controller. Error in the Controller's estimate of Appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by an adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, aggregate City Appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year from 2001-2002, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City Appropriations for services for children which are eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law).

(h) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?
Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday, November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. on Election Day. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on Election Day.
PROPOSITION K

Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a "domestic partnership"?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: At the November 6, 1990 election San Francisco voters approved the Domestic Partners Ordinance. It allows two unmarried adults who live together and agree to share basic living expenses to establish formally their relationship as a domestic partnership. The Domestic Partners Ordinance also sets out procedures for establishing and ending a domestic partnership.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Domestic Partners Ordinance to remain in effect.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

If the Ordinance is repealed, in my opinion, it should not increase or decrease the cost of government.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition K to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,320 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,921 more than the required number of signatures.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

“DOMESTIC PARTNERS” IS DISHONEST!
The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have betrayed the People! They promised domestic partners, (DP) would cost nothing, then immediately enacted benefits costing millions of dollars!

BAD FOR BUSINESS!
Under threats of litigation, businesses will be forced to pay higher benefits for DPs, a move that will surely drive more businesses out of San Francisco! . . . Or offer no benefits to any employee!

OFFENSIVE TO RELIGIONS!
Government sanctioned quasi-marriages continue to offend traditional cultural standards of Islam, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity. A small interest group puts its wants ahead of hundreds of generations; collective wisdom!

- Our whole system of laws and government is based upon concepts of right and wrong derived from biblical standards. In fact, “We hold these truths to be self-evident!” Religion is not the enemy of freedom and good government; tyrannical fanaticism is.

“DOMESTIC PARTNERS” IS ILLEGAL
Wrong approaches produce wrong results. If domestic partner-ship is good, why do insurers insist DPs are significantly more expensive to insure? Our City Charter, since 1972, has defined “dependent” as spouse and children. By what right is the Charter expanded to include DPs as dependents? Only the People have powers to amend the Charter of San Francisco!

DESTRUCTIVE OF COMMUNITY!
- Faith in FAIR, HONEST GOVERNMENT is being destroyed by deceptive reporting of Health Service costs. The Mayor’s plan to shift The City’s AIDS funding onto the backs of City workers — especially RETIRED City workers! Despite efforts to conceal added costs to legitimate benefit plan members, rates have already gone up, shortfalls are being paid out of reserve funds, and there is no end in sight!
- Cynical domination of the well meaning majority by a greedy, minority in the name of “respect” destroys democratic goodwill!

VOTE YES ON K! REPEAL “DOMESTIC PARTNERS” ORDINANCE!

Gingmon Randolph
San Franciscans for Responsible Government

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The proponent of Proposition K implies that repealing the Domestic Partnership law will save businesses and the city money. That’s nonsense.

He makes this deceitful argument because he knows voters won’t accept his true purpose: to get rid of this cost-free law which lets couples who agree to care for each other register at City Hall.

The Domestic Partnership law has been on the books for a year. Not one business has been forced to pay higher benefits for domestic partners. That’s because the law doesn’t require anyone to provide any benefits to domestic partners.

Proposition K won’t save the City any health care costs either. That’s because Proposition K will have no effect on the City’s health plan at all. Proposition K repeals the law which allows domestic partners of city employees to buy coverage in the city’s health plan.

In fact, the City Controller’s official analysis of Prop. K says that it won’t save taxpayers a cent.

Allowing couples who agree to be legally responsible for each other to file a statement at City Hall is the least we can do to show respect for these important, vital relationships.

Keep the Domestic Partnership law.
Vote No On K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Since the voters passed the Domestic Partnership law last November, hundreds of San Francisco couples have shown their dedication to each other by registering as domestic partners. By doing that, they have made their commitment to care for each other both public and legally binding.

Many of the couples who have pledged themselves to each other as domestic partners are lesbians and gay men, who have no other means of legally recognizing their relationships.

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to take this away.

Proposition K claims to be designed to end the city’s policy of allowing the domestic partners of city employees to participate (at their own expense) in the city’s health plan. Not true.

The health policy was adopted by the Health Services Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors because both Boards thought it was only fair. But whether you agree with this or not, Proposition K will have no effect on the health plan whatsoever.

Proposition K won’t save taxpayers one cent.

The only thing that Proposition K does is to repeal the law which allows lesbian, gay, and other unmarried couples to register their relationships. The health plan policy wouldn’t be changed at all.

Proposition K is a deceptive and cynical attempt to use arguments about health benefits to get rid of the registration law.

The Domestic Partners law has cost the city nothing. All of its administration has been paid for by the fees paid by the couples who register. The Domestic Partnership law has helped give all San Franciscans the respect they deserve. Keep the Domestic Partnership law and reject this deceptive political initiative. VOTE NO ON K.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

In 1989, the voters rejected DP (domestic partnerships) because it was a clear giveaway of “special privileges” to a “special interest” group. Mayor Agnos and his allies have called them “mean-spirited” because they disagreed. Agnos and his cronies give people who disagree with them “mean” labels. Their tactics are clear.

San Francisco voters have been supportive of legitimate needs of citizens. But they cannot be intimidated anymore by the mean-spirited politics of a vocal few! Fireman and long-time president of the Health Board, Harry Pareetchan, wrote about effects DP will have.

He wrote:

Never before has an issue been presented to the Board with such far reaching negative ramifications upon our membership and system. All the testimony, documentation and evidence fell on deaf ears. They knew exactly what they were going to do before they entered the room. They cared not for the membership who must now pay increased rates to fund domestic partners.

I’ve never seen a better “orchestrated” scenario in my twenty year career on the board. The Mayor’s appointee, Jack Loos was the “conductor”. The “fix” was in; Increases will effect members in ALL categories, INCLUDING RETIREES. Did any of these individuals seem to care? The answer: NO! They received their orders from “CITY HALL”

Mr. Agnos tell us the full truth; Money is taken away from families and children, the disabled, homeless and seniors to allocate MILLIONS for Special Interest health coverage.

PROPOSITION “K” WILL SAVE MILLIONS! PLEASE VOTE YES ON K

SRG, Gingmon Randolph
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Domestic Partners Repeal

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Domestic Partners isn’t a Civil Rights issue. We as minority women take offense in that the special interest promoting Domestic Partners are attempting to get special privileges on the basis of an unnatural sexual conduct.

Civil Rights have always applied to people of unchangeable characteristics such as skin color, sex, or severe handicaps.

Homosexuals are attempting to get “Elite Status” on a “behavior” that can be modified.

DON’T BE MISLED, VOTE YES ON K.

Brenda Williams
Chiang Ngah Cheong

“No City Benefits” said the Domestic Partners people. Then, quickly and underhandedly, they took City Benefits. This flagrant dishonesty comes as no surprise.

The sages have said, “Break ye down sexual fences, and, ultimately, other moral/ethical fences will fall.” Let us not allow our City to officially recognize these relationships that break down sexual fences, lest, thereby, we invite the corruption of moral/ethical values all around. Please repeal the Domestic Partners measure now.

Please vote Yes on K.

Rabbi Leib Feldman

Honesty is part of good society. The direction taken by supporters of domestic partners is dishonest. During the campaign for domestic partners, the proponents argued that this measure was about “recognition” not “benefits”. Within one week of passage, their campaign manager said that “benefits” were the goal.

City government granted domestic partners benefits. Their next goal is similar recognition and benefits from firms doing business with the city, then recognition and benefits from private firms in general.

Supporters claim domestic partners costs employers nothing, but insurance providers have indicated that increases in rates for everyone will be part of any domestic partners coverage. Business can’t afford these increased costs.

Vote for less government interference with business.

Vote Yes on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian, Business Owner

Board of Supervisors:
“As a retired City employee I most vehemently oppose “domestic partners” being added to present health care coverage. I gave all my energies in 20 years of employment for the City expecting in return to get benefits to cover my retirement years. Now my security is being eroded by increases in program costs, and by an immoral proposition which the Board is bending to under political pressure.” Helen Governale

Above is a genuine letter sent to our Supervisors. This letter was among many, all were against benefits! San Franciscans for Responsible Government, (SRG) salutes retired city employees for their years of service. If you’re a city employee, active or retired and feel the pinch on your finances, SRG is here to help. Together we will make a difference! Help this campaign, send $15.00 for membership, more if you can. SRG Box 347321, San Francisco, CA 94134

San Franciscans for Responsible Government is a broad based multi-ethnic coalition, composed of individuals from business, religious and community institutions, dedicated to restoring honesty and accountability in City government.

Karen Wong

The Supervisors and Mayor illegally enacted legislation, that provides live-in lovers of municipal employees a share of San Francisco health program, irrespective of their medical condition. Federal and San Francisco health plans explicitly limit coverage to employee’s spouse and children (Section 8.428).

San Francisco is a city governed by charter, which can only be altered by a vote of the people. If Mayor Agnos and the Supervisors wish to change the word “spouse” to read Domestic Partners (DP), then by law, it must be submitted to a vote. Therefore, an employee’s live-in lover is not eligible to participate in the health service system.

The Mayor has said he will continue offering health benefits to live-in lovers even if DP is repealed, thereby, compounding the illegality. However, without DP it will be impossible to identify eligible candidates. Our politicians have positioned themselves above the law. This action, if allowed will set a precedent for future violations. Therefore, send a strong message to City Hall.

Reject this violation of our rights! Vote YES on K.

Marcel Weiland
San Franciscans for Responsible Government
Let’s send a strong message to those who have betrayed the trust of The People. The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have arrogantly granted “domestic partners” (DP) benefits that will cost our city millions! Now the burden is being placed on the backs of retired city workers! How shameful! After years of dedicated service, is this how we want to repay our civil servants?

This law if left standing will in a short time explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our city! It is so loosely written that attorneys are calling it “a new field in law.”

**DID YOU KNOW THAT DPs DON’’T EVEN NEED TO LIVE IN SF TO GET BENEFITS!**

Fed up? San Franciscans for Responsible Government represents you. Together we will make a difference! Please send what you can to help this campaign. Become a member: Send $15.00, more if you can, SRG Box 347321 San Francisco, CA 94134

Marcel Weiland

Robert Achtenberg lost a case defining dependents of employee’s families. In Himman v Personnel Administration, a homosexual tried to establish his partner as his spouse to qualify him for benefits. The court held the state’s policy promoting marriage advances by confirming statutory rights on married partners. Without legislation no basis exists for extending rights to nonmarital relations. Only a man and woman can marry. (Civ. Code 4100). Are our “leaders” treating domestic partners as married? This isn’t legal, San Francisco health plans limit coverage to employee’s spouses and dependents. The voters reaffirmed this seven times. An employee’s friend is not eligible to participate in the health service system. Yes on K will repeal the basis for the Mayor’s illegal acts!

The charter provides “It shall be the duty to apply benefits without special favor or privilege.” Granting health benefits to domestic partners is a special favor and privilege. Harry Pareitchan, President of Health Board, claims a fix was in before the April 1991 meeting of the Health Board.

The Board met to reduce health premiums. Now increases will take effect. Is this equitable? Does it make sense to allow domestic partners benefits and to deny it to mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers? Not unless you are beholden to the gay political machine. Send a message to the fools in silly hall. Just say no to special interests. Say no to domestic partners. Yes on K.

Russell Davis

Promoters of domestic partners now talk of forcing private businesses to pay for benefits! How will this affect our business community? Will businesses be driven out of San Francisco to avoid more government regulations and an increasingly hostile business environment? Could this affect our tax base? Our jobs?

They promised us domestic partners would cost nothing! Can we afford to find out how much it’ll really cost?

**VOTE YES ON “K”!**

Tim Robinson

---

Vote Yes on K. Stop extending city administered health insurance fringe benefits to any friend, an active or retired municipal employee, 46,000, chooses to designate a domestic partner and that person’s dependents.

Vote K yes. Repeal the domestic partners law. Health insurance is a voter mandated fringe benefit still restricted by Charter laws to employees and dependents. Neither the Mayor, supervisors nor ordinance of any kind may modify Charter laws. Our Supervisors without legal authority, contrary to laws enacted legislation including domestic partners in this health insurance program. State and federal laws prohibits persons of the same sex from marrying. Consequently, employees’ friends, unless legal spouses, or dependents may not be granted these benefits.

Vote K — Yes, granting a city fringe to friends of employees is powerful evidence that our civic leaders think they can ignore voter laws. Vote Yes. Show them they’re wrong.

Vote yes — Unless domestic partner law is repealed, health insurance cost, for everyone, not only municipal workers will skyrocket beyond affordability of many people.

Vote yes — If the Mayor and supervisors are allowed to get away with this mockery they will soon be dipping into the multi-million dollar fund for retired employees’ pension.

Vote yes — All of our elected representatives as well as the mayoral candidates are aware that extending a city fringe to persons other than municipal employees is illegal. But don’t expect any of them to have the courage to oppose or even criticize this illegal legislation.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

"In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law."
- United States Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, 1896
95 years later, some people still don't get it.
NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Labor unions representing 79,000 San Francisco workers have supported our city's domestic partnership program. Join us in voting NO ON K, to stop the repeal of domestic partnership rights.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

San Francisco Tomorrow is an environmental group working to improve the quality of life in the City. The Domestic Partners law does just that for many. Vote to keep it. Vote NO on K!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Please stand with me and reject this attack on lesbians and gay men.
Voters of San Francisco adopted the domestic partners ordinance last year. No sooner did voters act when a misguided group launched a repeal drive.
This repeal saves taxpayers nothing. It does not take back health benefits. It just strips away the rights of domestic partners to register their relationships.
Help affirm the rights of every person to justice, respect, and freedom from discrimination. I urge you to reject bigotry, and put an end to this annual ballot bashing against our own people.
Stop the repeal of domestic partners.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

Simple Fairness.
Gay and lesbian families deserve the same standing, benefits, and respect as all families.

Michael S. Bernick, BART Director
James Fang, BART Director

Gloria Esiela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to deny recognition of an important element of the diverse family life that has been the hallmark of San Francisco. As Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Family Policy, I studied San Francisco's families. As a candidate for elected office, I campaigned for domestic partnerships. As Supervisor, I have voted to support domestic partnerships as well as other families that contribute so much to San Francisco.
The repeal of the domestic partnership registration system takes away the ability of couples, both gay and straight, to pledge their legally binding commitment to one another and the City's ability to recognize that commitment. Repealing domestic partnerships serves no valid public purpose.
I urge you to vote no on Proposition K.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Last year the Board of Supervisors passed and the voters upheld the Domestic Partners Ordinance.
The proponents committed that there would be no cost to the taxpayers as a result. This commitment has been honored.
Now there is an attempt to prevent the Health Service Board from allowing domestic partners to provide health insurance for their partners at no expense to the public. All City employees are already required to pay the health costs of any spouse, partner or dependent.
It is foolish and mean-spirited to try to prevent City workers from providing health care insurance for their loved ones at their own expense.
Please join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Last year, we fought FOR Proposition K. This time we are fighting AGAINST Proposition K. But the principle remains the same: Domestic Partnership is a fair and just way to recognize lesbian, gay and other non-traditional families.

Join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Your mother told you not to hate anybody.
Listen to your mother.
NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Domestic Partnership is about Justice. The measure passed by the voters last year requires no city tax dollars; it is completely self-supporting. Support of Domestic Partnership and opposition to Proposition K represents the consensus position of the elected leadership of San Francisco.

The Domestic Partners ordinance provides a legal registry to foster respect for lesbian, gay and other unmarried couples. This is one way San Francisco can address the discrimination and neglect they face. We urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition K, so that our city can continue to officially encourage loving and caring families.

Nancy Pelosi, United States Congress
Milton Marks, California Senate
Willie Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly
John Burton, California Assembly

None of the horrors predicted by the opponents of the original partners legislation came to pass. This sour grapes proposition would repeal a law that is working just fine, hurting no one, and not costing taxpayers a dime. San Francisco works best when we respect each other, and this measure accords respect to lesbians and gays and other committed couples.

Mayor Art Agnos

Communities of color have always led the fight for equality and challenged the discrimination which designated “white” only jobs, schools and recreational facilities or immigration laws which separate our families. Domestic Partnership is the only law to allow the participation of lesbian and gay couples to have family status. It is the only mechanism to register their relationships to allow them equal treatment.

We must stand together with the lesbian and gay members of our own African American, Latino, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Native American communities and with all lesbian and gay couples who seek equal treatment for their relationships. Proposition K would repeal the domestic partners law and prevent these couples the same public recognition and respect of their relationships that we give others. Let us protect this step towards dignity and the fair treatment of all. Don’t allow these rights to be taken away. Vote No on Proposition K.

Ignatius Bau
Barbara Cameron
Henry Derr
Tessie Guillermo
Ericka Huggins
Don Masuda
Enola Maxwell
Jose Medina
Barbara Neighbors-Glass
Ruth Picon

Karen Pierce
Leonila Ramirez
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Doris Thomas
Leland Yee
Vu-Duc Vuong
Lawrence Wong
Alan Wong

There’s one issue on which all of the major candidates for Mayor agree. We’re all voting NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a deceptive and misguided attempt to repeal the domestic partners law that San Francisco voters passed last year.

The domestic partners law has worked well, providing legal recognition of the diversity of family life in our city — at no cost to taxpayers.

Proposition K perpetuates divisiveness and bigotry when we should be striving for mutual respect.

Join us in voting NO on Proposition K.

Art Agnos
Angela Alioto
Richard Hongisto
Tom Hsieh
Frank Jordan
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Domestic Partnership is an issue of CHOICE! The lesbian and gay community, with the approval of San Francisco voters, has created a process for the city to recognize their relationships through a registration system, since they are not legally eligible for marriage. A small section of religious fundamentalists are trying to overturn this legislation. They want to impose their lifestyles on the entire population — preventing women from exercising their right to choice relating to pregnancy — preventing lesbian and gay couples from exercising their right to the choice of loving relationships of their own sex.

If we cannot demonstrate the importance of maintaining our freedom of choice here in San Francisco, it will surely be endangered throughout the country. Vote No on Proposition K.

Regina Gabrielle, Executive Director, Womens’ Building
Helen Greico, S.F. National Organization for Women PAC
Roma Guy, Founder Womens’ Building
Leni Marin, Chair, S.F. Commission on the Status of Women

Almost everyone has lost a friend, relative, co-worker or lover to AIDS. Our city has witnessed a crisis beyond all scope but we have seen an enormous amount of caring and love that has poured out in response to the AIDS epidemic.

The lesbian/gay community, through its response to AIDS and in a hundred other ways, has shown it has the power to love and care. A “No” vote on Proposition K will continue domestic partnership and continue to recognize the love and commitment shared by lesbian and gay couples, and will bring all our communities together as part of the family of San Francisco.

Valentine Aguirre, Latino Coalition on AIDS/SIDA
Angela Davis, Bayview Hunter’s Point Foundation
Anne Guillory-Thom, American Indian AIDS Institute
Pat Norman, California AIDS Intervention
Eric Rofes, Shanti Project
Lee Woo, Black and White Men Together

(organizations for identification purposes only)

The San Francisco Democratic Party Supports Domestic Partnerships. By an overwhelming majority, the Central Committee has voted to maintain Domestic Partnerships and to oppose Proposition K.

The Democratic Party has a strong tradition of support for civil rights and individual freedoms.

In San Francisco, let us define what we consider a family.

Join your local Democratic Party in recognizing the diversity of families in our city.

We urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION K.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic Party
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O’Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudes, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agor Jaiques, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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"Equal" rights has to apply to everyone. Or it really isn't "equal" at all.

Whatever improvements might be needed in the existing "domestic partners" legislation, its basic goal is to stop discrimination against minorities.

That's in the interest of all minorities — and we add up to a majority.

Proposition K would bring back discrimination against one minority. If it passes, which minority will be next?

Grassroots

All San Franciscans deserve fairness, justice, and the support of family.

Domestic partners registration costs the city nothing.

We admire the caring that strengthens our entire San Francisco family.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K.

Veronica Abrickis, Catholic
Reverend Steven Ailen, Zen
Jorge Arango, Catholic
Reverend Louis Ashley, Glide Memorial
Reverend Mary Arwood, Episcopal
Danny Barutha, Catholic
Dorothy Beattie, Integrity
Rabbi Allen Bennett, American Jewish Congress
Reverend Susan Bergmans, Episcopalian
Reverend Walter Boek, Lutheran
Reverend Jerene Broadway, Southern Baptist
Kevin Calegari, Catholic
Reverend Robert Cromeys, Episcopal
Reverend James Delange, Lutheran
Reverend Paul Dirdak, Methodist
Reverend Judith Favor, United Church of Christ
Brother Derek Ford, Jail Chaplaincy
Reverend Ruth Frost, Lutheran
Marilyn Geist, Integrity
Reverend Lee Gerdes, Lutheran
Darlene Giast, Catholic
Reverend Peter Hayn, Episcopalian
Reverend Michael Hertz, Presbyterian
Reverend Glenda Hope, Presbyterian

Reverend Neil Housewright, Disciples of Christ
Father James Jelinek, Episcopalian
Reverend Jeff Johnson, Lutheran
Rabbi Yoel Kahan, Sha'ar Zahav
Reverend Chuck Lewis, Night Ministry
Reverend James Lowder, Southern Baptist
Reverend Jane Medena, Southern Baptist
Reverend Canon Michael Merriman, Grace Cathedral
Rabbi David Meyer
Frederick Millen, James Markunas Society
Reverend James Mitulski, Metropolitan Community Church
Bob Nelson, Lutherans Concerned
William Rates, Episcopalian
James Rix, Evangelicals Concerned
Reverend Penny Sarvis, United Church of Christ
Reverend Jane Spahr, Presbyterian
Reverend Buddy Truax, Metropolitan Community Church
Father Tom West, o.f.m., Catholic
Reverend Mickey Williamson, United Church of Christ
Rabbi Peretz Wolf-Prusan, Emanu-El
Reverend Phyllis Zillhart, Lutheran

"Populations of whiptail lizards in the southwestern U.S., Mexico and South America consist of females only."

“The animals are unusual among vertebrates in reproducing by parthenogenesis: virgin birth.”

— Scientific American 1/84

Religious extremists oppose Domestic Partners because their interpretation of Scripture tells them homosexuality is "unnatural". Those scriptures can’t explain why scientists have found so much homosexuality in nature — including five species of lesbian lizards. These “whiptails” reproduce without males.

Yet a solitary female can’t reproduce — she has to go through a sexual “mating dance” with another female before she can ovulate!

“Scriptures” were what we had before books were invented. Taboos on “adultery” and “sodomy” served to reduce sexually transmitted diseases; other ways were unknown.

Times change. Rigid sexual taboos are obsolete.

Condoms protect much more reliably than sermons.

Don’t bring back an antiquated discrimination. Vote NO.

Grassroots
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

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

The People amend The San Francisco Administrative Code by Repealing Chapter 62.1 through 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance Sec. 1. HISTORY

(a) The Domestic Partners Ordinance was initially proposed in San Francisco during the Feinstein Administration. It was approved by the Board of Supervisors but vetoed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. In 1989 The Domestic Partners Ordinance was again approved by The Board of Supervisors and was signed into law by Mayor Art Agnos. The Domestic Partners Ordinance was then rejected by the People in a referendum vote known as Proposition "S".

(b) In 1990 The Board of Supervisors again approved and proposed a modified version of the Domestic Partners Ordinance know as proposition "K", having removed the costly health benefits provision, The Board of Supervisors promoted the Domestic Partners Ordinance as a symbolic initiative to give homosexual relationships formal recognition. The People of San Francisco were promised in the official ballot arguments, by The Board of Supervisors, and special interest groups, that proposition "K", the Domestic Partners Ordinance would not put a financial burden on the City or its citizens. The proponents promised that the Domestic Partners Ordinance would be fully funded by its registrants.

(c) In June of 1991, The Board of Supervisors voted to offer a costly health benefits package to unmarried couples registered as Domestic Partners, and employed by the City. Mayor Art Agnos has indicated that he will sign the bill into law.

(d) The Supervisors who approved and submitted proposition "K" before The People are: Allott, Brit, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Mayer, Walker, and Ward.

Sec. 2. FINDINGS

(a) Whereas, The People of San Francisco have been misled by their elected Supervisors, and the special interest groups supporting the Domestic Partners ordinance, into believing that no monetary benefits would be granted to domestic partnerships.

(b) Whereas, The Board of Supervisors, after removing the controversial health benefits package, and promised to The People, that this measure was cost free, have now circumvented their promise and The People of San Francisco by approving health benefits.

(c) Whereas, Insurance companies covering City employees have asked for an estimated $2,000,000. (two million) or more, to expand coverage to domestic partners for the first year!

(d) Whereas, due to the likelihood of a large percentage of A.I.D.S./H.I.V. related claims, the estimated $2,000,000. (two million) for the first year will most likely be much higher in subsequent years.

(e) Whereas, health premiums to city employees, and retired City workers with fixed incomes will be increased to cover the health benefits granted to these unmarried domestic partners.

(f) Whereas, The Domestic Partners Ordinance threatens to directly cost the City millions of dollars in court costs due to the vagueness of the text. The Domestic Partners Ordinance allows one partner to sue the other for "failure to give notice". It is also unclear as to what will happen to the property, or the children of these domestic partners once they break up. The Domestic Partners Ordinance is a litigation time bomb that threatens to explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our City.

Sec. 3. By the will of The People of San Francisco

(a) The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by repealing in its entirety Chapter 62.1 to 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance.

The following is the text of the ordinance which would be repealed by Proposition K.

RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

Sec. 62.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this ordinance is to create a way to recognize intimate committed relationships, including those of lesbians and gay men who otherwise are denied the right to identify the partners with whom they share their lives. All costs of registration must be covered by fees to be established by ordinance.

Sec. 62.2. DEFINITIONS

(a) Domestic Partnership. Domestic Partners are two adults who have chosen to share one another's lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring, who live together, and who have agreed to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses incurred during the Domestic Partnership. They must sign a Declaration of Domestic Partnership, and establish the partnership under section 3 of this chapter.

(b) "Live Together." "Live together" means that two people share the same living quarters. It is not necessary that the legal right to possess the quarters be in both of their names. Two people may live together even if one or both have additional living quarters. Domestic Partners do not cease to live together if one leaves the shared quarters but intends to return.

(c) "Basic Living Expenses." "Basic living expenses" means the cost of basic food and shelter. It also includes the expenses which are paid at least in part by a program or benefit for which the partner qualified because of the domestic partnership. The individuals need not contribute equally or jointly to the cost of these expenses as long as they agree that both are responsible for the costs.

(d) "Declaration of Domestic Partnership." A "Declaration of Domestic Partnership" is a form provided by the County Clerk. By signing it, two people agree to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses which they incur during the domestic partnership and that this agreement can be enforced by anyone to whom those expenses are owed. They also state under penalty of perjury that they met the definition of domestic partnership when they signed the statement, that neither is married, that they are not related to each other in a way which would bar marriage in California, and that neither had a different domestic partner less than six months before they signed. This last condition does not apply if the previous domestic partner died. The form will also require each partner to provide a mailing address. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.3. ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a) Methods. Two persons may establish a Domestic Partnership by either:

1. Presenting a signed Declaration of Domestic Partnership to the County Clerk, who will file it and give the partners a certificate showing that the Declaration was filed; or

2. Having a Declaration of Domestic Partnership notarized and giving a copy to the person who witnessed the signing (who may or may not be the notary).

(b) Time Limitation. A person cannot become a member of a Domestic Partnership until at least six months after any other Domestic Partnership of which he or she was a member ended. This does not apply if the earlier domestic partnership ended because one of the members died.

(c) Residence Limitation. The County Clerk will only file Declaration of Domestic Partnership if:

1. The partners have a residence in San Francisco;

2. At least one of the partners works in San Francisco. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.4 ENDING DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

(a). When the Partnership Ends. A Domestic Partnership ends when:

1. One partner sends the other a written notice that he or she has ended the partnership; or

2. One of the partners dies;

3. One of the partners marries or the partners no longer live together.

(b). Notice the Partnership Has Ended.

(1) To Domestic Partners. When a Domestic Partnership ends, at least one of the partners must sign a notice saying that the partnership has ended. The notice must be dated and signed under penalty of perjury. If the Declaration of Domestic Partnership was filed with the County Clerk, the notice must be filed with the clerk; otherwise, the notice must be notarized. The partner who signs the notice must send a copy to the other partner.

(2) To Third Parties. When a Domestic Partnership ends, a Domestic Partner who has given a copy of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership to any third party, (or, if that partner has died, the surviving member of the domestic partnership) must give that third party a notice signed under penalty of perjury stating the partnership has ended. The notice must be sent within 60 days of the end of the Domestic Partnership.

(3) Failure to Give Notice. Failure to give either of the notices required by this subsection

(Continued on next page)
will neither prevent nor delay termination of the Domestic Partnership. Anyone who suffers any loss as a result of failure to send either of these notices may sue for actual losses.

Sec. 62.5. COUNTY CLERK’S RECORDS

(a). Amendments to Declarations. A Partner may amend a Declaration of Domestic Partnership filed with the County Clerk at any time to show a change in his or her mailing address.

(b). New Declarations of Domestic Partnership. No person who has filed a declaration of Domestic Partnership with the County Clerk may file another declaration of Domestic Partnership until six months after a notice the partnership has ended has been filed. However, if the Domestic Partnership ended because one of the partners died, a new Declaration may be filed anytime after the notice the partnership ended is filed.

c). Maintenance of County Clerk’s Records. The County Clerk will keep a record of all Declarations of Domestic Partnership, amendments to Declarations of Domestic Partnership and all notices that a partnership has ended. The records will be maintained so that amendments and notices a partnership has ended are filed with the Declaration of Domestic Partnership to which they apply.

(d). Filing Fees. The Board of Supervisors will set the filing fee for Declarations of Domestic Partnership and Amendments. No fee will be charged for notices that a partnership has ended. The fees charged must cover the city’s cost of administering this ordinance. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.6. LEGAL EFFECT OF DECLARATION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a). Obligations. The obligations of domestic partners to each other are those described by the definition.

(b). Duration of Rights and Duties. If a domestic partnership ends, the partners incur no further obligations to each other. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.7. CODIFICATION. Upon adoption, the Clerk of the Board shall codify this amendment into the San Francisco Administrative Code. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.8. FILING FEES. For each filing of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership and each Amendment to a Declaration of Domestic Partnership the County Clerk shall charge a fee of $35. (Added by Ord. 2-91, App. 1/14/91)
HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333

MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote. Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.
Phelan Avenue Use

PROPOSITION L

Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from "P" (Public Use District) to "NC-2" (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City owns about 30 acres of property on Phelan Avenue across from City College. The Balboa Reservoirs cover about 28 acres of this property. The "Phelan Loop," at the corner of Phelan and Ocean, occupies about another 2 acres. There is a bookstore and a turn-around for Muni buses on the Phelan Loop.

The City is negotiating to have built on the Phelan Loop: 120 units of affordable housing for seniors, about 9300 square feet of commercial space, 3250 square feet of office space, a Muni drivers' rest stop, and parking for 57 cars.

The Phelan Loop is currently zoned "P" (Public Use District). This means that it can be used only for public purposes. The Phelan Loop must be rezoned before the proposed development could be allowed. The Planning Commission has approved the proposed development but only if the Phelan Loop is rezoned.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed an ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop to "NC-2" (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). Before that ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would approve the ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop from "P" (Public Use District) to "NC-2" (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). The proposed development would be permitted if the Phelan Loop is rezoned "NC-2."

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from "P" to "NC-2" to go into effect.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from "P" to "NC-2" to be rejected.

Controller's Statement on "L"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How "L" Got on the Ballot
On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition L to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 12, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 23,420 of the signatures submitted were valid, 4,622 more than the required number of signatures.
Phelan Avenue Use

PROPONET’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

A YES VOTE ON Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing, a new MUNI driver restroom and some 9,300 square feet of neighborhood serving retail space will be built in a location that presently houses only a MUNI stop along Ocean Avenue. This two acre parcel is not now nor has it ever been a part of City College and it’s development as affordable senior rental housing will in no way impair the ability of City College to expand into the “Balboa Reservoir” to the north.

San Francisco’s senior population, which numbers more than any other Bay Area County, both as a percentage of the total population and in absolute numbers, critically needs this housing. Ocean View critically needs this infusion of neighborhood serving retail space. The rezoning is consistent with the neighborhood commercial use of this portion of Ocean Avenue and it’s 40 foot height limitation is actually some 20 feet below the maximum allowable height. The rezoning and development of this senior affordable rental housing is a win-win situation for our City’s seniors, the local neighborhood and City College. In fact, right now over 2,000 seniors attend City College, and many of them could qualify for the proposed housing.

Vote Yes for senior housing, vote Yes for neighborhood serving businesses, vote Yes for improved MUNI driver facilities; Vote Yes for Proposition L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh
Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONET’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I disagree with Art Agnos when he says this land is not needed by City College. That has been his claim through three elections, and he is still wrong.

Housing can go elsewhere. City College can’t.

Education, of primary importance to the children of our city, is in deep trouble. Lack of education is a root cause of unemployment, resulting poverty, homelessness, crime and drug abuse.

As the world becomes technologically advanced, it becomes imperative we expand and improve our educational system. For children of lower and middle income families, City College provides their last if not their only opportunity for an affordable college education.

To support our future and the future of our children, we must support City College. Who owned this land in the past is not an issue.

The issue is whether we are going to support City College.

Richard Hongisto

I concur. Remember when AGNOS TRIED TO SELL 11.6 ACRES of the campus to a developer for $36,900? This is part of the same piece of land.

I was active in liberal politics long before Art Agnos arrived, carpetbag in hand. I say HONGISTO HAS THE BEST CHANCE OF RESCUING OUR CITY

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
John Riordan, City College Board Emeritus

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

WHAT? AGAIN?

Incredibly, this is the FOURTH TIME this issue has been on the ballot.

This is part of the Balboa Reservoir that was once part of the CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS. Repeatedly the voters of San Francisco have refused to rezone part of the old West Campus. Repeatedly they have voted to give it back to the college.

Since then, the college has made plans for the land. But here they are back again with a last ditch effort to divert part of the land into private hands.

The land is the same, the issues are the same, even the letter of the proposition is the same. The voters said “L NO!” three years ago, and should say the same again.

This is about EDUCATION.
This is about COMMUNITY COLLEGE LAND.
This is about access to affordable education for CHILDREN OF LOWER INCOME AND WORKING CLASS FAMILIES.
City College serves all incomes, but for many it is the college of last resort. It has become the BIGGEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN THE WORLD cramped into the smallest campus in the state.

This land is crucial to the planned and much needed development of the “West Campus.” It is presently occupied by the California bookstore, a needed college serving facility, and the City College Station, the key transportation hub of the campus.

Liberals, conservatives, and moderates support City College and the surrounding neighborhood on this issue. See separate arguments by Candidate for Mayor RICHARD HONGISTO and State Senator QUENTIN KOPF. Also urging you to vote NO is Candidate for Mayor TOM HSIEH. On this issue they all agree.

On November 6, vote “L NO!” and SAVE CITY COLLEGE LAND — AGAIN.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Dave Wall, City College Physics Professor
Lou Baitmale, City College Chancellor Emeritus

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The opponents' argument against Proposition L is simply factually wrong. Proposition L will not harm City College and they know it.

FACT: In the months of public testimony over this rezoning before the Public Utilities Commission, the Planning Commission and the Board, no current official of City College testified against the rezoning nor raised any objection about the senior housing proposed for the site. No such official City College opposition exists.

FACT: The Phelan Loop has never been a part of a “West Campus” of City College. It has been owned by the PUC and used for a fire station and MUNI stop. Both uses will continue if L passes. The privately owned book store can also be accommodated in the 9,000 square feet of retail space in the senior housing development.

FACT: The 28 acres of Balboa Reservoir that City College has requested is in the process of being transferred to them by the PUC.

FACT: Both the old and the new City College Master Plan do not include the Phelan Loop site as it is not needed for the college’s future expansion.

The simple truth is that the opponents of L are try to hold hostage critically needed senior housing to further some obscure private agenda. It’s time to quit playing private politics with public land.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

San Francisco has the highest percentage of seniors of any city in California with a population of over 100,000. Over half of these seniors are paying more than 50% of their income on housing. Senior homeowners cannot afford to make needed repairs on their homes and pay for other necessities. Senior renters are living in sub-standard conditions, unable to pay for adequate health care or food after rent.

A Yes Vote on L would allow for the construction of 120 units of affordable senior housing by a community based, non-profit housing development corporation. These units would give seniors living on fixed incomes the opportunity to live productive lives in a caring and supportive community — in units that are safe and affordable.

Show you care about the lives of San Francisco senior citizens. Vote Yes on L.

Erma Brim, SF Grey Panthers
George Twigg-Porter, Apostleship of Prayer
Clarissa Ward, SF Legislative Forum for Older Americans
Edward L. Peet, Ca. Legislative Council for Older Americans
Bruce McSpadden, SF United Methodist Mission
Geraldine Earp, Senior Action Network
Philip Klasiky, Yerba Buena Consortium
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Robert Pender, Park Merced Residents Association
Rochelle Fraizer, SF Business and Professional Women
William Price, Jr., Congress of California Seniors, RegII
Joe Lacey, Pres., TURN
Wendy Brown, San Francisco AIA
Sanit Peters, Catholic Committee on Aging
Kathleen Lammers, California Law Center on Long Term Care
Meg Doherty, SF Long Term Care Ombudsman Program
Frank Salat, California Senior Legislature
Howard Levy, Legal Assistance to the Elderly
Jane Holt, Central YMCA Senior Program
Annie Chung, Self Help for the Elderly
Leo McCarthy, Lt. Governor
Milton Marks, State Senator
John Burton, State Assembly

As neighbors of the proposed senior housing on the Phelan Loop site, we urge you to vote YES on L.

The Phelan Loop site has been an eyesore in our neighborhood for too long! Everyone wins with the proposal for this site. Seniors get housing they can afford; MUNI drivers get new break and restrooms they need; City College gets a new pedestrian arcade and space for future expansion is preserved. The community will see an eyesore replaced with a well designed building anchoring the eastern end of the Ocean Avenue commercial strip serving as a gateway to our neighborhood.

Vote YES on L and support both our seniors and our neighborhood.

Ocean View-Mered-Ingleside
   Community Association
   Merchants Association of OMI
   Joseph G. Kennedy Democratic Club
   Ingleside Community Center
   OMI Senior Center
   Southwest Neighborhood Improvement Group
   Ingleside Presbyterian Church
   Minnie Ward
   Geraldine Clay

Rev. Roland Gordon
L. Andrew Jeannie
Edward and Christina McGovern
Claude and Zenobia Everhardt
Bill Taylor
Linda Johnson
Bettie Simon
Leneal and Marcelle Henderson
Bob Landis

San Francisco needs permanently affordable senior rental housing. The proposed rezoning will allow the development of 120 such units along Ocean Avenue. It is supported by neighborhood merchants, community groups and senior organizations all across the City. As environmentalists, we strongly urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Ed Emerson, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Andy Nash, SFT*
Tony Kilroy, SFT*
Peter Moylan, SFT*
Charlene Clark, SFT*
Bernie Choden, SFT*
Norman Rolfe, SFT*

*For ID purposes only

Mayor Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

A Yes vote on Proposition L is a YES for seniors, a YES for MUNI, a YES for City College, a YES for area merchants and a YES for the community. Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing will be built on a vacant eyesore known as Phelan Loop. It will also ensure that a new MUNI driver’s rest stop and a new bus stop will be constructed in the loop. It will provide for a pedestrian arcade for students walking to City College. It will also provide 9,300 sf of neighborhood serving retail space, and will serve as a gateway to the Ocean Avenue commercial corridor and the community.

The building is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood with its 40 foot height limit. The proposed zoning — NC-2 — is the prevailing zoning on Ocean Avenue, and would complete the Ocean Avenue residential/commercial corridor to the east.

With over 50% of our City’s seniors paying over 50% of their income on housing, this housing is critically needed. Our seniors deserve to live in a safe, secure and friendly environment, in a home they can afford.

Vote YES for senior housing, Vote YES for MUNI, vote YES for City College, vote YES for neighborhood merchants, vote YES for the community. Vote YES on L.

Rev. John Lane, Co-Chair
Jim Feliciano, Co-Chair
Sue C. Hestor, Tres., Phelan Loop Senior Housing Coalition

As church and community based non-profit affordable housing producers we strongly urge a Yes vote on Proposition L. Affordable senior housing is critically needed by our City’s 140,000 seniors, over 60% of whom are officially classified as either very low or low income residents. Rezoning this two acre parcel on Ocean Avenue will mean that 120 seniors will have an affordable and decent place to live.

Rene Catenave, Council of Community Housing Organizations
Maryann Dillon, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Geraldine Johnson, SF Housing Development Corp.
Calvin Welch, Haight-Ashbury Community Development Corp.
Chuck Turner, Community Design Center
Gordon Chin, Chinese Community Housing Corporation
David Brinque, Community Housing Partnership
Randy Shaw, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Francis McKinney, San Francisco Housing Development Corp.
Marylow Goeke, Catholic Charities
Kelly Cullen, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

A Yes vote on Proposition L would allow the rezoning of some two acres of land along Ocean Ave. for the purpose of developing 120 permanently affordable apartments for seniors and some 9,000 sf of neighborhood serving retail space. Approval of this rezoning in no way prohibits the future expansion of City College. The site has only been used for a MUNI stop and that use will continue even after the senior housing is developed.

Our City is in critical need of housing able to be afforded by low income seniors. This development will meet that critical need and add to the neighborhood serving retail uses along Ocean Ave. Its height and density is in keeping with the existing character of the street. We strongly urge you to Vote Yes on Proposition L.

James B. Morales
Wayne Hu
Douglas Engmann
Susan J. Bierman
Edward C. Sewell

CITY COLLEGE DOESN’T NEED THE MUNI STATION AND WE DON’T NEED CITY COLLEGE

In the old days, people used to struggle to go to college, struggle to find a job, and struggle to find housing. City College was set up in the old days when San Franciscans thought people should struggle.

Now days, we have television so people don’t need to read and struggle for education. They don’t need to struggle to find a job or housing. Leaders like Art Agnos are showing the way so that people don’t have to struggle.

There is a lot of space at City College that could be better used for housing than for flowers, grass, and playing fields. These days, we have more relevant things to do with public land.

I not only urge you to vote YES, I urge the City to rezone most of the rest of the campus for affordable housing.

Lewis Epstein, Humanitarian

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

SAME OLD THING
This is the same old public land give-away you turned down three years ago and the year before that.
IGNORE CLAIMS OF “AFFORDABLE” HOUSING. As a realtor and retired Supervisor, I advise you it’s all HOGWASH.
The way it’s set up, most of the HOGS that would benefit would have MORE THAN AVERAGE INCOME.
Don’t let greedy developers take a big chunk of valuable City College campus.

John Barbagelata

Voters have TWICE AGREED WITH US that the acreage in question can best be used to RELIEVE THE OVERCROWDED CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS.
Nothing has changed.
Join us again by voting NO on L.

Lou Batmale, Chancellor Emeritus, City College

SAFETY
TWO STUDENTS A YEAR ARE KILLED on Ocean Avenue since streetcars stopped pulling into the CITY COLLEGE STATION.
Building apartments PREVENTS SOLUTIONS.
SAVE STUDENTS LIVES. Vote NO on L.

Dave Wall

EDUCATION is the biggest and most important investment we can make in our future. We should be adding space, classrooms and library shelves to CCSF.
STOP TAKING LAND FROM OUR COLLEGE.

Roger Olson

THE CAMPUS KEY
Agnos, after three elections to sell 12.6 ACRES of public land to a private developer for $36,900, still wants the key Ocean Avenue frontage, the transportation hub of the campus, for his developer friends.
L No!

Dave Wall

Progressive San Franciscans will not allow so-called “affordable” housing to be played off against legitimately affordable education.
The costs of a college education are skyrocketing. Many more San Francisco students will be attending City College in the future, because it is excellent and affordable. But there are 28,000 students at crowded City College now, will there be facilities for them in the future?
NOT IF THE WEST CAMPUS IS SOLD A DEVELOPER.
LABOR SAYS NO on L.
The future education of thousands of San Franciscans is at stake!

American Federation of Teachers — Local 2121 Committee on Political Education.
Mike Hulbert, President

OVERWHELMING NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION
Precincts next to the college have voted up to 95% against rezoning this land in THREE previous elections.
L NO! to rezoning.
HELP THE NEIGHBORHOOD HELP THE COLLEGE.

Ellen Wall, Sunnyside
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The fact that this issue even has to be on the ballot is an insult to the voters of San Francisco.

The public has determined three times not to rezone this piece of public property to allow developers to build housing in an already congested area, deciding instead to return the area to City College of San Francisco (the world’s most populated community college), because it needs space.

Vote “NO” on Proposition L

In 1986, 1987 and 1988 the voters determined that City College’s use of the property outweighed the benefits of developing the land. Anyone who visits the area during the day knows the importance of the reservoir area to CCSF. CCSF provides San Franciscans of all socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds the opportunity to receive a college education. This unique educational policy has provided hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans the chance to succeed in today’s competitive world. Its growing population has, however, been greeted with a shrinking campus.

The latest intrusion would create a huge private apartment building, approximately the size of the City College Science Building, directly across the street from the tiny campus. The building would provide 29 parking spaces for 120 units. Planners assert that 20,000 students a day would be funneled through a narrow tunnel in this private structure, downwind of diesel bus fumes, on their way to class. It doesn’t take a Rhodes Scholar to realize City College needs the area for our children and grandchildren who strive mightily for education in a painful environment. Vote “NO” on Proposition L.

San Francisco Taxpayers’ Association
Vice-President Quentin L. Kopp

A federal audit discovered that 52 cents out of every taxpayer dollar HCDC, the Phelan Loop developer got went for “administration”, not housing.

You pay for the proposed housing the developer will profit from, but You don’t get preference.

Vote NO on Prop L—“Poverty Profiteering”

Peter Paul
Veritas Journal & Reform Government

Taking city college without the support of the people is not democratic. Don’t let AGNOS and his political cronies get away with this ill conceived land grab. NO-L-NO

Rich Bodisco
Chairman, S.F. Reasonable Reform

Rick Fenton
A Concerned Citizen

Beware of sly landlords and vindictive politicians who drive up rents and tax middle class voters to house the poor and elderly.

A crowded, noisy campus is inappropriate for this undistinguished project. The City should prepare a comprehensive plan allowing for classroom and library expansion and more appropriate student-oriented housing.

The most affordable housing is existing affordable housing. Vacancy rent control must be preserved; evictions and unconscionable rent hikes stopped!

Don’t be fooled by deceptive, big-money campaigns!

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS FOR NO ON L AND YES ON M

Brian Doohan — SOMA
Barbara Meskunas — Western Addition
Joel Ventresca — Haight
Margaret Verges — Presidio
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ADOPTING CHANGES IN PROPERTY USE CLASSIFICATION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 11 PHELAN AVENUE, NORTHWEST CORNER AT OCEAN AVENUE, A PORTION OF LOT 1, ASSISOR'S BLOCK 3180 FROM A P (PUBLIC USE) DISTRICT TO AN NC-2 (SMALL-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) DISTRICT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 101.1 OF THE PLANNING CODE.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to resolution of the Board of Supervisors, adopting the final negative declaration as its own, and pursuant to Section 302(c) of the City Planning Code, Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the following change in property use classification, duly approved by resolution of the City Planning Commission is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco.

Use District

Superseded: Use District

Approved

NC-2

Description of Property

Beginning at the north end of the curve with a radius of 39.60 feet between the westerly line of Phelan Avenue and northerly line of Ocean Avenue as shown on Parcel 2 on Parcel Map of the Widening of Phelan and Ocean Avenues, filed February 15, 1954, in Map Book “R”, page 56, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco; thence on said curve to the right, tangent to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue, with a radius of 39.60 feet through a central angle of 104°52'08", an arc length of 72.48 feet to the northerly line of Ocean Avenue, as widened; thence along said northerly line tangent to the preceding curve 16.41 feet; thence deflecting to the right 76°36'57" 137.64 feet; thence deflecting to the left 92°32'39" 138.01 feet; thence deflecting to the left 88°56'26" 99.35 feet to a point on the northerly line of Ocean Avenue; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 104°52'08" 265.40 feet; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 0°26'4" 48.44 to the southeast corner of the parcel described in Deed from City and County of San Francisco to Safeway Stores Inc., a corporation, recorded June 2, 1954, in Book 6386, Page 412, Official Records; thence deflecting 90° to the right along the easterly line of said Safeway Stores parcel and its prolongation 171.18 feet; thence deflecting to the right 74°18'59" 378.28 feet; thence deflecting to the left 9°28'25" 81.04 feet to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue; thence deflecting to the right 99°51'14" along said westerly line 264.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; being a portion of Lot 1 in Assessor’s Block 3180; and adjacent street areas to their centerline as designated on Sectional Map No. 12 of the Zoning Map.

Pursuant to Section 101.1 of the Code, this Board of Supervisors adopts City Planning Commission Resolution No. 13042 approving findings related to the Eight Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of the Planning Code.
PROPOSITION M

Shall the City's rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?

YES ➞ NO ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City's rent control law, which went into effect June 13, 1979, limits rent increases for current tenants in certain residential units. Annual increases of between 4% and 7% are allowed, depending on increases in the cost of living. The law does not limit, however, the amount of rent a landlord may charge a new tenant after the current tenant moves out.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed a Vacancy Control Ordinance. For vacant units covered by rent control, this ordinance would limit rent increases for new tenants who move in on or after July 1, 1991. Before the ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would approve the Vacancy Control Ordinance. Under the ordinance, a landlord could charge a new tenant between 10% and 14% more than the rent paid by the last tenant, depending on how long the last tenant had lived in the unit. This increase would be allowed only once every three years. In addition, a landlord could charge allowable annual increases not charged to the last tenant back to June 13, 1979, when rent control went into effect. Landlords also could seek initial rents above this 10% to 14% limit if the last tenant moved in before June 13, 1979.

A landlord would have to give a new tenant a detailed written statement of how the allowable rent was determined. The tenant could have the Rent Board staff review the statement and approve the rent. If either the landlord or tenant did not agree with the result, either could use the existing appeals process.

Violations of the ordinance could result in the tenant recovering overpaid rent, plus punitive damages. It would be a misdemeanor to charge more than the allowable rent.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to go into effect.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to be rejected.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, there should be no effect on the cost of government.

How "M" Got on the Ballot

On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition M to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 9, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 30,502 of the signatures submitted were valid, 11,704 more than the required number of signatures.
Vacancy Control

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a fair compromise that protects tenants from completely unlimited rent increases and allows an increase equal to twice inflation or more for landlords who have acted fairly.

Proposition M will put an end to completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments. It will close the loophole in our Rent Law that has fueled the skyrocketing of rents to unreasonable levels.

Without vacancy control, there is a huge incentive to evict in order to get that unrestricted rent increase. And unfortunately some landlords respond to that incentive to evict, simply to hike up the rent. The elderly, the disabled, long term tenants, and lower income people are the victims.

Proposition M will replace these completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula based on the length of time the previous tenant lived there, how big the rent increases have been in the past, and increases in the landlords costs.

Landlords can raise the rent 10% on a vacant apartment if the previous tenant lived there five years or less, 12% if that previous tenant moved out after six years, and 14% if the tenant moved out after seven years or more.

The Fair Landlord provision of Proposition M protects landlords who have not raised their tenants' rent each year. When the tenant moves out the landlord may raise the rent on the vacant apartment to what the rent would have been if they had raised it each year. And that's in addition to the 10%, 12%, or 14% increase. Proposition M is essential to maintain affordable housing in San Francisco.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achenberg, Alioto, Hallinan, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh and Kennedy
Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vacancy Control is opposed by a broad cross-section of citizens from every community in our city.

Vacancy Control makes false promises.

Vacancy Control promises fewer evictions.

IN FACT, evictions have declined by 2/3rds in San Francisco between 1986 and 1991.

Vacancy Control promises affordable housing.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control in Berkeley and Santa Monica has led to a reduction in the supply of affordable rental units.

Vacancy Control advocates promise that the Rent Control bureaucracy will not grow larger and more expensive.

IN FACT, the rent control bureaucracies in Berkeley and Santa Monica have grown 10 times more expensive after Vacancy Control was implemented — costing tenants millions more in higher rents and taxes.

Vacancy Control promises to lower rents.

IN FACT, tenants will be forced to pay higher rents when the costs of building improvements are added to monthly rent bills.

Vacancy Control promises a better city.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control will permanently damage our city.

Since 75% of the S.F. housing stock was built before 1940, improvements and repairs are necessary to keep rental units maintained. By writing a law which encourages owners not to improve their property, Vacancy Control will lead to declining neighborhoods and declining property values.

All bad laws begin with a false promise. Don’t be deceived by the many false promises of Vacancy Control.

NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar
Executive Director
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M — VACANCY CONTROL WILL RAISE RENTS FOR TENANTS AND LOWER PROPERTY VALUES FOR HOMEOWNERS. VOTE NO ON M.
Vacancy control is a failed social experiment, imported from Berkeley and Santa Monica, that will create higher rents, deteriorating neighborhoods, a costly Rent Board bureaucracy, and lower property values in our city. San Francisco tenants and homeowners must not become Vacancy Control’s next victim.
RENTERS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.
By limiting increases on vacant units, Proposition M will give landlords incentive to raise rents beyond the 4% cap by passing through on monthly bills 1) improvements such as painting, a new roof, remodeling etc; 2) increases in the operations and maintenance of your building; 3) utility rate increases, and; 4) increases of debt service for loans.
Also, your present $8.00 per year Rent Board tax will grow to over $100.00 when the Rent Board requires registration of units to police Vacancy Control. Vacancy Control removes incentives for apartment owners to maintain property — hurting poor renters first and leading to massive deterioration of rental property.
LONG TERM TENANTS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.
PASSTHROUGH rent increases have occurred in only 15% of units. To benefit transient tenants, Vacancy Control will raise rents for stable tenants by giving landlords the incentive to implement PASSTHRUGHS for every building and every unit.
VOTE NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.
HOMEOWNERS BEWARE!
Proposition M creates a $10 million annual bureaucracy when vital services to our neighborhoods such as police, fire and libraries are being cut. Vacancy Control lowers home values by encouraging the spread of urban decay to every neighborhood in our city.
To many homeowners, a home represents life savings and secure retirement.
Home values must be protected.
NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The opponents of Proposition M are the official lobbyists for the biggest landlords and real estate developers in the City.
They represent those interests well and we respect them for it.
But when they pretend to represent tenants and homeowners — well, it just isn’t believable. In fact, if they did that, they would not be doing the job they are paid to do.
The landlords and developers say Proposition M will raise rents.
If this was true — why would they oppose it?
They are opposing Proposition M because it replaces completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula, using the existing system without cost to city government.
Under Proposition M, landlords could still raise rents by up to 14% on vacant apartments. That’s three times the rate of inflation.
Rents could, under proposition M, be raised by even more if they haven’t been raised each year.
These are fair increases that protect renters and landlords.
The City Controller states that “Proposition M will have no effect on the cost of Government.”
The analysis by the impartial ballot simplification committee confirms that the “existing appeals process,” not registration, is used. There is no $10 Million bureaucracy.
Realtors and the city’s largest landlords don’t like Proposition M because it will treat both landlords and tenants fairly. They don’t like Proposition M because it will work.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Limiting rent increases on vacant apartments is essential to preserving the affordable apartments we have left in our city. Without vacancy control, rents more than doubled during the 1980s. According to City Planning statistics, only 30% of our city's households can now afford the price of a two-bedroom apartment.

Because of severe cutbacks in state and federal funding, the City cannot build affordable units fast enough to replace those lost due to rent increases. We risk losing affordable housing every time an apartment becomes vacant and the landlord is free to raise the rent without limit.

The legislation passed by the Board and signed by Mayor Agnos will not deprive any apartment owner of a fair return on his or her investment. It provides a mechanism for adjusting rents for good landlords who have not raised the rent for many years and who might suffer if only allowed a flat percentage increase.

Proposition M helps protect all San Francisco residents. Please help save affordable housing by voting yes on Proposition M.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I have consistently supported vacancy control because it is needed to keep San Francisco affordable for people from all walks of life.

This vacancy control law is both fair and reasonable.

To save vacancy control, please join me in voting YES on Proposition M.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments are just too big an incentive for many landlords to resist. Unfair evictions of long term and elderly tenants are the frequent result. We know because we see it happening every day. Proposition M cuts this eviction incentive, allows reasonable increases, and uses the existing Rent Board system. Vote yes on M!

Polly Marshall, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Denise Stephenson, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Vivian Hammill, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Jake McGoldrick, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner

San Francisco's lesbian and gay community always has shown leadership on issues of fairness. That's why all of our community's elected officials fought so long and hard for the vacancy control law that is Proposition M.

Proposition M is fair to conscientious landlords who keep rents low for elderly, disabled or low-income tenants, it allows bonus rent increases on vacated apartments that have been kept below market rate.

Proposition M is fair to tenants because it ensures that San Francisco will have affordable, well-maintained apartments in the future. Don't believe the scare tactics of the real estate industry. Once again they're raising the ridiculous argument that San Francisco will become a slum. The truth is, property values are skyrocketing, and nobody in their right mind is going to lose money in San Francisco real estate.

Resist the real estate industry's expensive smokescreen campaign of deception and distortion. Stand up for a fair balance between the needs of landlords and tenants. Vote YES on M!

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

We as members of the Latino community in San Francisco support Proposition M, which will provide for control over the rents of vacant apartments.

The accelerated rise in rental housing prices over the last decade have made it increasingly difficult for working class Latino families to afford living in San Francisco. Proposition M will remove an important incentive for eviction of long term tenants, relieve overcrowding, and slow down the process of gentrification currently afflicting our neighborhoods.

Ruth Picon
Jose Medina
Maria Martinez
Commissioner Jim Morales
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The Justice and Peace Commission of the Archdiocese of San Francisco has been on record as supportive of some vacancy control measures since this legislation was introduced. I quote from the Catholic Bishops Pastoral: Economic Justice For All: "Economic decisions have human consequences and moral content; they help or hurt people, strengthen or weaken family life, advance or diminish the quality of justice in our land."

More and more people are not making it, especially families. They have a right to affordable housing. We believe that the present rent control law, while providing needed assistance to renters, does not go far enough. The lack of vacancy control provides a loop-hole that actually encourages some landlords, as I believe that most are honest, to encourage tenants to move out. As a result, the stock of rental units for low income people, and middle class people, continues to be depleted.

This is a fair ordinance, but, moreover, it is something we should do for the common good, for the good of the poorest among us, for the good of those families who want to live in the City and struggle to do so.

Justice and Peace Commission
Archdiocese of San Francisco

Proposition M is fair to landlords and provides needed protection for tenants. I know because I sponsored Prop. M only after an extensive series of meetings between landlords and tenants.

Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Proposition M would:
- Allow landlords 10%, 12%, or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there.
- Reward landlords who kept the rent low by allowing a further increase to recover past yearly increases they didn’t give.
- Let landlords who got caught with low rents when rent control first came in catch up.

And existing law already provides for:
- Annual increases pegged to inflation.
- Increases that cover the costs of work done on apartments.

Stop unfair and completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments! Vote yes on M.

Doris Ward
President, Board of Supervisors

Stop unlimited rent increases — Vote yes on M!

Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Community Tenants Association
David Spero
Richmond District Democratic Club

Don’t buy the developers bull!
They can raise the rent to cover inflation, the cost of any work they do to the apartment, and to cover any increase in operating or maintenance costs.
Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Prop. M would cap those increases to an amount equal to twice the rate of inflation.
If your salary or business’ income went up like that, you’d probably think it was more than fair.
But the big landlords and realtors aren’t satisfied, they want even more!
Tell the real estate lobby not to be so greedy. Tell them Prop M is fair. Vote yes on M!

Affordable Housing Alliance

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges you to VOTE YES on Prop. M.
Friendly pedestrian neighborhoods near jobs and markets get residents out of their cars. When high rents make neighborhoods less affordable, or tenants are threatened with evictions so rents can be raised, neighborhoods become less stable and friendly. People move to the suburbs where they drive three times as much, polluting the air and consuming more energy. This in turn fuels the arguments of the oil industry which wants to drill for oil in the Arctic and other pristine areas, and further threatens our coasts from tankers.
Keep San Francisco neighborhoods stable and friendly. VOTE YES ON PROP M.

League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Advocates for homeless people agree; homelessness is caused by San Francisco’s high rents. The only longterm solution to homelessness is to give homeless people a chance to get off the streets and take control of their lives.

Prop M will enable homeless people to rent their own apartments by lowering the cost of moving in.

The Real Estate Lobby profits from high rents and homelessness by opposing Prop M, and spreads falsehoods which cloak their true responsibility for the human misery real estate speculation and rent-gouging have created.

HOMELESSNESS WILL ONLY BE SOLVED BY ENSURING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

YES ON M!

Coalition On Homelessness

Thousands of affordable apartments will be lost unless we vote yes on Proposition M.

Why? Because there are thousands of apartments that are affordable now, but when the current tenants move, the rent will go through the roof, thanks to the loophole in our Rent Law that allows unlimited rent increases.

Proposition M will fix this loophole and protect tenants and affordable housing. Instead of unlimited increases, landlords could get 10%, 12% or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there. Landlords could get more if they had not raised the rent each year.

Proposition M is fair to landlords and will provide needed protection to tenants. Vote yes on M.

Assemblyman John Burton

46% of San Francisco renters pay more than 30% of their income in rent. For poor households, the percentage of income spent on rent is even higher — between 50% and 70%!

Don’t allow rents to get any higher! Keep vacancy control — Vote Yes on M!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s St. Peter’s Housing Committee

* according to Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1990

The San Francisco Tenants Union — the largest tenant counseling organization in the city — urges a YES vote on Proposition M.

San Francisco Tenants Union

Reasonable limits on rent increases will maintain affordability and protect the diversity San Francisco is famous for. Vote Yes on M!

San Francisco Tomorrow

This is a fair measure that was written during a three-year period of negotiations in which people on both sides made concessions. It fights hyper-inflated rent increases which continue to drive working and middle-class people out of San Francisco. Some landlords and realtors decided that if they couldn’t have it all their way, then they would agree to nothing — and spend one million dollars to see that tenants get nothing. Don’t be deceived by all their money. Proposition M will help keep San Francisco affordable. Please vote “yes”.

Mayor Art Agnos

Recently, I was contacted by a Marina resident who angrily recalled signing a petition “to reduce rents”. Deception and intimidation being the landlords’ and realtors’ strategy, it’s vital to know who’s behind the No on M campaign:

Clint Reilly unsatisfied with his millions from big insurance companies, wants one last killing before driving off into early retirement in his Yuppiemobile...

Jack Davis squanders tenants’ rent money on food fights in plush eateries with buddies like the Mitchell Brothers while the homeless and hungry press noses to the window in despair and disbelief.

And the landlords and realtors who hired them include condo conversion crook Bill Rosetti and Leona Helmsley.

Do you expect the truth from these vermin?

Send them a message! VOTE YES!

Brian Doohan

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

In 1988 the Vacancy Control Campaign gathered over 100,000 votes in favor of a far stronger measure despite being outspent 40-1. Since opponents of Proposition M again have an overwhelming abundance of cash matched by their utter absence of integrity, it's important to remember some lowlights of 1988:

Shortly after extorting the support of apartment maintenance workers, the landlords mailed thousands of flyers featuring a corrupt building manager accepting a television for an apartment referral. That's how the landlords treat their friends!

Another piece of junk mail attempted to intimidate renters by bragging that landlords would raise rents through passthroughs and let buildings fall into disrepair. Today, without vacancy control, the Department of Public Works has a backlog of over 700 buildings with life-threatening violations.

And after falsely claiming enforcement would cost $43,000,000 in 1988, the same landlords are using lack of registration as reason to vote against Proposition M.

Remember, every lying billboard, radio commercial or junk mailer against Proposition M was paid for by the rents of hard working San Franciscans who have enough trouble keeping a roof over their head.

Don't believe the landlords' bull! Vote YES.

The Vacancy Control Campaign

Proposition M was put on the ballot by landlords in an attempt to repeal the Board of Supervisors' recently-passed vacancy control measure.

We need stricter vacancy control, a rent freeze and a ban on evictions. Housing is a right!

Gloria Estela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports vacancy control. We have fought for a measure like Proposition M for a decade. Without vacancy control, rents in vacant apartments have skyrocketed. This loophole in the City's rent control law also created an incentive for landlords to evict tenants.

Proposition M is a fair law to protect tenants and allow landlords a fair rate of return. The opponents of Proposition M who put this on the ballot are motivated by unlimited profit, not the well-being of tenants.

Rents in San Francisco are already too high. Let's put a lid on unlimited rent increases!

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco County Democratic Party
Connie O'Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Catherine J. Dodd, RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley B. Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco cannot afford the Proposition M vacancy control scheme.
Not only is vacancy control a proven failed housing policy, it will harm our city’s economy, cost millions in lost revenue, and result in reduced services.
In other cities, vacancy control has failed to achieve its promised benefits, destroying rental housing, ruining neighborhoods and discouraging investment in housing. Do not burden San Francisco with another destructive ordinance.
Keep San Francisco’s economy strong.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

History shows that every city that has tried vacancy control has ended up with more housing problems. Berkeley has lost over 13% of its rental housing since it enacted vacancy control. Thirteen percent of the San Francisco rental housing supply is 26,000 units. Tenants and the city would be in terrible shape if San Francisco repeated the Berkeley experience and thereby lost 26,000 rent units.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Honorable James Fang, BART Board Member
Honorable Michael Bernick, BART Board Member
Honorable Chuck Ayala, Community College Board

Once again the city’s electorate is being asked to vote on vacancy control. Three times the voters have voted it down, but here we are again!
Under the best of circumstances administering vacancy control will cost between $15-20 million.
Doesn’t the city have enough demands on its revenue sources? Many of our existing programs are in need of funding — why then build yet another bureaucracy?
Vote NO on Prop. M.

Bob Ross, Publisher
BAR (Bay Area Reporter)

If vacancy control passes, it would be a devastating blow to the construction industry which employs about 25,000 people.
As the incentive for property owners to fix up their buildings is eliminated, the erosion of badly needed jobs will be quickly realized. WHO NEEDS VACANCY CONTROL?
VOTE NO!

Joe O’Donoghue, President
Residential Builders Association

Funding for AIDS not bureaucracy!
Vote No on vacancy control.

Ray Chalkers, Publisher
The Sentinel

We strongly encourage you to vote No on Proposition M.
Vacancy control is harmful to the interests of renters, home and apartment owners. It can cause decay in our neighborhoods.
Vacancy control has had negative impacts in the other California cities. Don’t let it harm San Francisco.
Please Join us in voting No on Vacancy control.

Bok F. Pon, Executive Director
Chinese American Outreach Program
Bill Chin, Former Chairman of Chinese Consolidate Assn.
Stephen Quan, Chairman of Hoy Ping Assn.
Kwok Ying Tang
Thomas H. Gee
Timothy H. Lau

As the former Assessor and Controller of San Francisco, we can assure you that vacancy control will reduce the amount of property taxes collected from rental property. San Francisco cannot afford a reduction in tax revenues. We urge you to vote NO on Prop. M.

Samuel Duca, Former Assessor
John C. Farrell, Controller,
City and County of San Francisco, Retired
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San Francisco does not need vacancy control. Market forces have kept rent increases for vacant apartments well below the inflation rate for over 5 years. There are thousands of vacant apartments in a broad price range available here for renters to choose from. Just check the Sunday papers.

We have served on the San Francisco Rent Stabilization Board for many years now and have observed a steady decrease in owners applying to impose pass-through rent increases. Renter complaints alleging unfair practices, such as decreased services or wrongful eviction, have also declined dramatically in recent years. Our current reasonable law has worked to stabilize rents and to bring some peace to rental housing relations in our city. Vacancy control will reverse that positive trend.

Currently, renters in San Francisco pay no more than $8 per year to operate our Rent Board. With vacancy control, rent board administrative costs will increase if Berkeley and Santa Monica can be used as examples. Renters in Berkeley and Santa Monica pay from $132 to $136 per year per apartment to pay for vacancy control. Few renters in Berkeley or Santa Monica will ever benefit from vacancy control. You won't benefit from it in San Francisco either. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Rent Board Commissioners:
Tim Carrico
Mamie How

Alternate Rent Board Commissioners:
Mike Rosoff
Bill Villa

As former city commissioners, we know that vacancy control is not part of a sound housing plan.
VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Nancy Lenvin, Former Pres, Public Utilities Commission
Preston Cook, Former Housing Authority Commissioner
Bruce Lilienthal, Founding Pres,
S.F. Small Business Advisory Commission

As Chair of the Board of Supervisors' Finance Committee I demanded an economic impact report of vacancy control prior to the Board's vote. I regret that this evaluation was not done.

The evidence from other cities strongly supports my belief that vacancy control will result in property owners seeking reassessments from the Assessor for their apartment buildings. Lower tax revenues mean a weak tax base and less resources to carry out vital city and human services.

Proposition M is fiscally irresponsible. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

As former supervisor I supported the current law.
I would vote again for the rent control ordinance, since it protects tenants-in-place. But would never support vacancy control.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Gordon Lau, Former Supervisor

Vacancy control does nothing to help low-income rental households. What we need is an earmarked fund that we can use to target subsidies for those who need them. Vacancy control, all too often, subsidizes new, upper income households that do not need assistance.

Additionally, vacancy control discourages the investment of small property ownership. We don’t want this city’s housing stock owned by only large investors.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie B. Kennedy, Member,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
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This is a POOR EXCUSE FOR A HOUSING POLICY. What San Francisco needs is a realistic, economically viable, socially progressive housing policy and this is not it!

Who wins under this new scenario? High-income wage-earners, who do not need this assistance, have their rents held in check while lower-income folks trying to get into the market are held back due to the increased competition for below-market values.

Not one cent should be wasted on such an undirected program. Help those who need help and keep effective incentives in place — we need rent control, but not vacancy control.

VOTE NO ON THIS MEASURE.

Joy Hahn
San Francisco Tenant

---

AS PROPERTY MANAGERS, WE ARE THE BENEFICIARIES of this legislation since we would choose the tenants for the below-market rental units. Yet we remain strongly opposed: Vacancy Control (VC) removes the last remaining market incentive for an owner to do a good job of taking care of their buildings. This policy encourages deterioration of our famed San Francisco housing stock as well as removes apartments from the available supply.

VC IS UNFAIR TO IN-PLACE TENANTS. New tenants could pay less than long-standing residents. Plus long-standing tenants could expect greater annual rent increases than their new better-off yuppie neighbors. Does this make sense? The ever-growing bureaucracy is the only winner with VC.

VC ENCOURAGES DISCRIMINATION against newcomers and low-income renters. Just try renting in Berkeley as a newcomer if you doubt this fact.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TOO IMPORTANT for us to continue to spend so much negative energy fighting about a stupid yuppie housing subsidy like VC. Let’s move ahead not backwards on affordable housing. Let’s work together to build affordable housing. Please, let’s vote No on M to stop Vacancy Control.

Chris Collins, Vice President
Jeanne Armstrong, 1990 President
Professional Property Management Association of San Francisco

I urge you to vote no on Proposition M. It is clear that those who support vacancy control have failed to consider its harmful effects on both renters and our City. We must implement housing programs that will encourage and provide low and moderate income housing, not discourage and stop it. We must encourage programs that will upgrade and repair existing rental housing as well as providing solutions to the earthquake dangers in unreinforced masonry buildings. We cannot afford to experiment with a program that promises improvements, but has failed to provide them in every city in which it has been tried.

Vote NO on Proposition M. Thank you.

John L. Molinari, Former President and Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Controls do not work. Rental controls on vacant housing have been disastrous in New York. The San Francisco Council of District Merchants’ Associations represents over 2000 businesses in the neighborhoods of the city.

We oppose vacancy control. Vote No on Proposition M.

Harold M. Hoogasian, President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants’ Associations

Our existing rent ordinance was designed to protect tenants in place by limiting annual rent increases. It has served our city well over more than a decade and shouldn’t be changed.

This is one of the most confusing ordinances I have seen in my many years in public office. Try reading it yourself! Its implementation will create an enormous bureaucracy which San Francisco can ill-afford.

What San Francisco needs is the creation of a sound housing policy which will meet the needs of our very diverse city.

Let’s stop building more bureaucracy.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.,
Speaker of the Assembly
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We are AIDS activists opposing Proposition M. Let's look at the facts.

One percent of San Francisco's population has died from AIDS. Another four percent is infected. San Franciscans become infected every day. While the City's response has been admirable, more money is needed.

Each year we are told there is insufficient money to fully fund vital AIDS services such as early intervention treatment and new education efforts for at-risk populations.

Vacancy control regulates rents on empty apartments, but is expensive to administer. Our current rent ordinance is funded by an $8 per unit fee (paid by renters). This will increase dramatically. The cost in California cities which have vacancy control is approximately $136 per unit. For San Francisco that amounts to over $27 million.

New laws for new bureaucracies can hardly be called progressive when implemented at the expense of AIDS funding.

Our tax money should be used to save as many lives as possible, not to regulate rents on the empty apartments of our dead friends!! Vote NO on Proposition M!

Peter N. Fowler
Jessie Dobson
Michael Rossoff
Gordon P. Crespo
David E. Bell
Michael C. Hall

Don't be misled by a few gay and lesbian politicians who support this radical vacancy control measure. They don't speak for our entire community.

We know that vacancy control reduces the quality of rental housing and leads to the loss of units. Many existing tenants will be faced with higher rents.

Most importantly, vacancy control reduces revenues from rental property which is needed to fund vital community services.

Join us in voting NO on Prop. M.

Log Cabin Club
Robert Speer, President

Vacancy Control is a bad idea. It hurts the poor. Destroys neighborhoods. And costs too much. It's failed in every city where it's been implemented. Berkeley and Santa Monica have vacancy control and have lost minority populations at a much greater rate than other California cities. When artificially capped rents stimulate demand, who gets the apartments? The wealthy, not the poor.

While San Francisco added thousands of rental units under the previous mayor, Berkeley and Santa Monica each lost thousands of units. Owners went out of business because they were losing money. Builders stopped building because they couldn't recapture costs. The eroded tax base now provides less money for essential services.

We can't afford vacancy control. Its administration will cost millions. Proponents' claims to the contrary are false. Santa Monica's original rent board budget was a few hundred thousand. Now it's $4.6 million. Berkeley's is $2.2 million.

San Francisco's rent board is financed by an $8 per unit fee (renters pay this either directly or it's included in their rent). Berkeley's unit tax began at $12 per unit. With vacancy control it's now $136. For San Francisco's approximately 200,000 units, that amounts to $27.2 million.

San Francisco renters are smarter than the politicians think, and would prefer spending their money wisely. Like providing AIDS services, helping the homeless, or cleaning our streets — not building bureaucracy, ruining our housing, and displacing minorities.

Voters have repeatedly rejected vacancy control. We're tired of the games.

Stop the madness!
Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Apartment Association
Committee to Preserve Rental Housing
Joseph K. Bravo, President

Rent control, as it exists now, works well for the tenants of this city. Anything more stringent would be a disincentive to the creation of more housing — something we are in desperate need of.

VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Jane Winslow
Community Activist
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Vacancy control is a flawed policy. It discourages landlords from maintaining buildings. It encourages tenants who are moving out to sell their leases to the highest bidder, not to the needy. And studies show that it gentrifies neighborhoods, not the other way around.

I have supported reasonable rent control. Under the current law, San Francisco rents have stabilized or have dropped due to market pressures.

More restrictive vacancy control doesn’t help low income renters because it creates an expensive new bureaucracy, paid for by renters. In San Francisco, the annual tax on renters to feed this bureaucracy could exceed $150. Current tenants would not benefit.

The history of vacancy control is a failed social and housing policy. It often subsidized the rich while it hurts lower income and minority families. It is a cruel hoax. Let’s not repeat that mistake in San Francisco.

Please join me in voting No on Proposition M.

Supervisor Bill Maher

Jobs are the lifeline that separate one from the ability to pay rent, meet one’s mortgage obligation or become homeless.

In the last few years, this city has witnessed an unbelievable erosion of job opportunities. Not just for construction workers, but at all levels of the job market.

This is the resultant of neanderthal governmental regulations. The enactment of vacancy control will assure fewer jobs in all areas of the housing industry.

Vote NO on Prop. M.

Larry Mazzola, Bus. Mgr. & Fin. Secty - Treas.
Local Union No. 38
Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry

Small Business has frequently been cited as the cornerstone of the San Francisco economy. We work here and we live here. We are opposed to vacancy control because we know it will have an adverse effect in the creation of housing for our customers and our employees.

* We urge you to vote No on Proposition M.

Andrew R. Ebon, Vice President
Small Business Network

The full burden of vacancy control will fall on small and new property owners, many of whom are and will be Asian American, unable to afford the professional staff that will be required to deal with the complex and constantly changing rules and regulations. It is the small community property home-owner which will suffer. Moreover, there is no evidence that cities with vacancy control have been able to improve or house low income or minority households. Vacancy control is a detriment to our community’s desire to fully contribute to American society.

James Fang, Executive Director, Asian American Voter Project

As most of the world embraces free market economic policies, City Hall persists with unnecessary regulatory interference on the rights of San Francisco property owners. We Republicans favor the retention of a free market for rental housing as a productive means to ensure affordable housing for all San Francisco residents. Therefore, we strongly oppose the addition of a vacancy control amendment to the existing rent ordinance.

Stringent vacancy control ordinances in other jurisdictions have led to the loss of rental units, deterioration of apartment buildings and the surrounding neighborhoods, weakened economic and fiscal health of the community, discrimination against low and moderate income and minority families, harm to the environment, and unfair infringement on the rights of rental property owners to earn a reasonable return on investment.

For those who wish to restore fiscal integrity and a robust economy to our City, the choice is easy.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.
Vacancy control (Proposition M on the Ballot) is an ineffective housing policy by any perspective. There are compelling arguments why it should be rejected.

- Vacancy control does not preserve housing for low- and moderate-income families. In communities with vacancy control, poor families are at a substantial disadvantage. By restricting rent levels, vacancy control forces housing providers to turn to other factors, such as income and credit worthiness, to choose among prospective tenants.
- By reducing the return on investment, vacancy control will lead to marked reductions in expenditures for building maintenance and repair. Over time, these reduced expenditures will take their toll on rental properties and the quality of housing services provided to tenants.
- Vacancy control will destroy the incentive for developers to build new rental units in San Francisco. Although San Francisco exempts new units from rent control, developers generally do not believe that communities which adopt stringent forms of rent control will refrain from eventually putting new units under controls, as New York City did. Hence, San Francisco’s housing shortage will get worse.
- The drop in real estate values brought about by vacancy control will lead to an erosion of San Francisco’s property tax base. Vacancy control does not result in long term benefits for either tenants or the community.

Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Association of Realtors
Helen Dawson, President

We strongly encourage San Franciscans to reject vacancy control by voting No on Proposition M.

Vacancy Control is harmful to the long-term ability of San Francisco to solve its pressing housing, social and financial problems. We need practical and effective solutions. Proposition M will create new problems. It will not solve our city’s existing problems.

We should be investing in our city’s future not voting for propositions that drag it down.

Thank you for joining us in voting No on Proposition M.

Allen Okamoto
Jackson Wong
John Fang
Anton Qui
Pablo Wong

Florence Fang
Yvonne Lee
Ivan Wong
Peter Yu

Homeowners Beware!

Passage of Proposition M will lead to the deterioration of San Francisco’s neighborhoods. It will also result in a reduction in property values. Vacancy control has had these effects in other cities.

Don’t be fooled into voting for vacancy control because you believe it will help renters. Evidence from other communities shows that it harms low-income and minority families, leads to poorer apartment quality and increases rents for current tenants.

Vacancy control will reduce taxes from apartments, resulting in fewer services for our neighborhoods and, possibly, increased taxes and fees for homeowners.

Please join us in voting No on Proposition M.

San Francisco Homeowners’ Council
Tim Carrico, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A AND 37.11A THEREOF, TO ESTABLISH LIMITATIONS ON INITIAL RENTS FOR RENTAL UNITS, CREATE A PROCEDURE FOR VERIFICATION OF INITIAL RENTS, PROVIDE FOR ARBITRATION OF INITIAL RENTS, AND FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED BY HEARING OFFICERS, CREATE A NEW CRIMINAL PENALTY AND ENLARGE THE SCOPE OF CIVIL ACTIONS.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Sections 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A and 37.11A thereof to read as follows:

Sec. 37.3. Rent Limitations.

(a) Rent Increase Limitations for Tenants in Occupancy. Landlords may impose rent increases upon tenants in occupancy only as provided below:

(1) Annual Rent Increase. On March 1 of each year, the Board shall publish the increase in the CPI for the preceding 12 months, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor. A landlord may impose annually a rent increase which does not exceed a tenant’s base rent by more than 60% of said published increase. In no event, however, shall the allowable annual increase be less than 4% or greater than 7%.

(2) Banked. A landlord who refrains from imposing an annual rent increase or any portion thereof may accumulate said increase and impose that amount on the tenant’s subsequent rent increase anniversary dates. A landlord who, between April 1, 1982 and February 29, 1984, has banked an annual 7% rent increase (or rent increases) or any portion thereof may impose the accumulated increase on the tenant’s subsequent rent increase anniversary dates.

(3) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may impose rent increases based upon the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation or energy conservation measures provided that such costs are certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(4) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(d) above.

(5) Charges Related to Excess Water Use. A landlord may impose increases not to exceed fifty percent of the excess use charges (penalties) levied by the San Francisco Water Department on a building for use of water in excess of Water Department allocations under the following conditions:

(A) The landlord provides tenants with written certification that the following have been installed in all units: (1) permanently-installed retrofit devices designed to reduce the amount of water used per flush or low-flow toilets (1.6 gallons per flush); (2) low-flow shower heads which allow a flow of no more than 2.5 gallons per minute; and (3) faucet aerators (where installation on current faucets is physically feasible); and

(B) The landlord provides the tenants with written certification that no known plumbing leaks currently exist in the building and that any leaks reported by tenants in the future will be promptly repaired; and

(C) The landlord provides the tenants with a copy of the water bill for the period in which the penalty was charged. Only penalties billed for a service period which begins after the effective date of the ordinance may be passed through to tenants. Where penalties result from an allocation which does not reflect documented changes in occupancy which occurred after March 1, 1991, a landlord must, if requested in writing by a tenant, make a good faith effort to appeal the allotment. Increases based upon penalties shall be pro-rated on a per room basis provided that the tenancy existed during the time the penalty charges accrued. Such charges shall not become part of a tenant’s base rent. Where a penalty in any given billing period reflects a 25% or more increase in consumption over the prior billing period, and where that increase does not appear to result from increased occupancy or any other known use, a landlord may not impose any increase based upon such penalty unless inspection by a licensed plumber or Water Department inspector fails to reveal a plumbing or other leak. If the inspection does reveal a leak, no increase based upon penalties may be imposed at any time for the period of the unrepaired leak.

(6) RAP Loans. A landlord may impose rent increases attributable to the Chief Administrative Officer’s amortization of the RAP loan in an area designated on or after July 1, 1977 pursuant to Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(7) Additional Increases. A landlord who seeks to impose any rent increase which exceeds those permitted above shall petition for a rental arbitration hearing pursuant to Section 37.8 of this chapter.

(8) Limitation on All Increases. Notwithstanding any other provision of Section 37.3, where a hearing officer, pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(7), has ordered that a tenant receive no increases because the landlord has failed to substantiate the initial rent, the Increases set forth in Section 37.3(a)(1)-(4) shall not be allowed.

(b) Notice of Rent Increase for Tenants in Occupancy. On or before the date upon which a landlord gives a tenant legal notice of a rent increase, the landlord shall inform the tenant, in writing, of the following:

(1) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the annual increase, and/or a banked amount, if any;

(2) Which portion of the rent increase reflects costs for capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures certified pursuant to Section 37.7;

(3) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the pass through of charges for gas and electricity, which charges shall be explained;

(4) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the amortization of the RAP loan, as described in Section 37.3(a)(6) above.

(5) Nonconforming Rent Increases. Any rent increase which does not conform with the provisions of this section shall be null and void.

(c) Initial Rent Limitation for Subtenants. A tenant who subleases his or her rental unit may charge no more rent upon initial occupancy of the subtenant or subtenants than that rent which the tenant is currently paying to the landlord.

(d) Establishment of Initial Rents. For tenants occupying a rental unit pursuant to a tenancy which begins on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge no more than the base rent of the previous tenancy plus the amounts listed below, as applicable:

(A) Vacancy Allowance. A landlord may charge an additional 2% per year over the base rent of the previous tenancy provided that the calculation of such figure begins on or after April 1, 1982. In no event, however, shall the vacancy allowance be less than 10% or more than 14%. In addition, this allowance shall not be imposed with respect to the previous tenancy was terminated either voluntarily by the tenant or pursuant to a lawful eviction under Section 37.9(a) below. This allowance shall also not be imposed more than once in any given 36-months period beginning on or after July 1, 1991.

(B) Banked.

(i) A landlord may charge any amounts which the landlord has banked with respect to the previous tenancy pursuant to Section 37.3(a)(2).

(ii) A landlord may also charge any annual rent increases which the landlord could lawfully have imposed with respect to the previous tenancy between June 13, 1979 and March 31, 1982 but refrained from imposing, provided that such increases do not exceed 7% per year for this period.

(C) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may charge for capital improvements or rehabilitation or energy conservation measures which have been certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(D) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(d) above.

(E) Fair Labor Standards Adjustment.

(F) CPI Adjustment. Where a pre-June 13, 1979 tenancy terminates on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge an increase equivalent to 60% of the annual increase in the Consumer Price Index, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor, for each year prior to June 13, 1979, provided that such increases were not imposed during this pe-
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landlord and/or tenant have filed a petition for hearing based upon the grounds and under the procedure set forth in Section 37.8, the Board may, in its discretion, consolidate certification hearings with hearings on Section 37.8 petitions.

(1) Notice of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. Burden of proof is on the landlord. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(2) Determination of the Hearing Officer. In accordance with the Board's amortization schedules and cost allocation formulas, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the proposed rent increases are justified based upon the following considerations:

(A) The application and its supporting documentation;

(B) Evidence presented at the hearing establishing both the extent and the cost of the work performed;

(C) Estimator's report, where such report has been prepared; and

(D) Any other relevant factors as the Board shall specify in Rules and Regulations.

(5) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed within 30 days of the hearing.

(6) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Certification Decision. If the hearing officer finds that all or any portion of the heretofore operative rent increase is unjustified, the tenant shall be ordered to pay the landlord that amount. If the tenant has paid an amount to the landlord which the hearing officer finds unjustified, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to reimburse the tenant said amount. In either case, however, such an order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party.

(7) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the BoardVacates his or her decision on appeal.

(8) Appeals. Either party may file an appeal of the hearing officer's decision with the Board. Such appeals are governed by Section 37.8(f) below.

Sec. 37.8. Arbitration of Rental Increase Adjustments and Verification Procedures.
(a) Authority of Board and Hearing Officers. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to verify initial rents and to arbitrate fair market adjustments, initial rent disputes and rental increase adjustments. The Board shall further have the authority to administer the rent increase protest procedures with respect to RAP rental units as set forth in Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) Verification of Initial Rents.

(1) A tenant whose tenancy begins on or after July 1, 1991 may request a verification from the Board of initial rent. The procedure shall be as follows:

(A) Filing. A request for verification must be filed within 240 days of the tenant's receipt of the rent disclosure statement; provided, however, that where a tenant never receives such a statement, the tenant may file no later than 365 days from the date his or her tenancy commenced. These time limits are mandatory and are therefore deemed jurisdictional. The form of the request shall be determined by the Board.

(B) Notice of Landlord. Upon receipt of the request, the Board shall notify the landlord and request the landlord to submit to the Board, within thirty (30) days of the notification, sufficient documentary evidence to substantiate the initial rent charged to the tenant.

(C) Documentary Evidence. A landlord's documentary evidence may include rent receipts, the rental agreement of the previous tenancy, or such other evidence as the Board may determine to be satisfactory by rule or regulation.

(D) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(2) The Board shall determine whether the documentary evidence submitted by the landlord is sufficient to substantiate the initial rent, or any portion thereof, charged to the tenant. The Board shall mail notice to the parties of its determination within thirty (30) days. All documentary evidence supporting the Board's determination shall be available for inspection by the parties.

(c) Request for Hearing on Determination of Initial Rent.

(1) Filing. A landlord or tenant who seeks to challenge or enforce the Board's determination rendered under Section 37.8(b) above may petition for a hearing on the initial rent. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the Board's determination. This time limit is mandatory and is therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(3) Effect of Filing. Filing a petition for verification or determination of initial rent does not relieve the tenant of his or her obligation to pay rent.

(4) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(5) Submission of Evidence; List of Witnesses. At least 72 hours prior to the hearing, both parties shall submit to the Board and to each other copies of all documentary evidence to be introduced at the hearing and a list of names and addresses of potential witnesses to be called. Failure to comply with this subsection may result in the exclusion of evidence and/or the dismissal of the petition.

(6) Hearing Record. In addition to evidence submitted at the hearing, the Board's prior determination and all documentary evidence supporting the determination shall be made part of the hearing record.

(7) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to the initial rent allowed to be charged under Section 37.3(d). If the hearing officer finds that the landlord has not substantiated the initial rent charged, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to continue to charge no more than the level of the initial rent. The Board shall keep a record, by address, of this order. Notwithstanding subsequent tenancies, if any, the order shall be in effect until it is vacated, modified or superseded by another order of the Board.

(8) Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. If the hearing officer finds that the initial rent charged the tenant exceeded the allowable initial rent under Section 37.3(d), the hearing officer may either order the landlord to refund to the tenant within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order said amount offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the landlord.

(9) Further Procedures Applicable to Arbitration of Initial Rent Disputes. Hearings conducted pursuant to Section 37.8(c) are further subject to the general hearing procedures set forth in subsections (f)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (h)(6), and (h)(8). Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(10) Additional Remedies. The remedies available in Section 37.8(b) and (c) shall be in addition to any other remedies available to the tenant or the Board.

(11) The Board shall promulgate rules and regulations for the administrative implementation of Section 37.8(c).

(4) Request for Hearing on Fair Market Adjustment.

(1) Filing. A landlord who seeks a fair market adjustment as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)(E)(ii) above may petition for a hearing. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board no later than 240 days after the commencement of the first new tenancy beginning on or after July 1, 1991. This time limit is mandatory and therefore jurisdictional.

(3) Further Requirements. In addition to the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (2) above, the fair market adjustment hearing and procedures shall be governed by subsections (e)(3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) above, and by subsections (f)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (h)(6) and (h)(8) below. Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(4) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether the landlord shall be permitted a fair market adjustment. If the adjustment is permitted, the hearing officer shall recalculate the initial rent as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)
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above. The adjustment shall be calculated prior to all other calculations of increases and allowances permitted under Section 37.3(d)(1). The hearing officer may order payment to the landlord within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact of any sums owed by the tenant as a result of the recalculations, or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the tenant.

(e) (e) Request for Arbitration. Hearing to Adjust Rents for Tenants in Occupancy.

(1) Landlords. Landlords who seek to impose rent increases which exceed the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a) above must request an arbitration hearing as set forth in this Section. Where there has been a prior order pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(7) which limited the rent increases for a tenant because the landlord failed to substantiate the initial rent charged, the landlord may request an arbitration hearing to establish the tenant's allowable initial rent based upon evidence which was not previously available due to good cause; provided however, that this limitation does not prevent a landlord from requesting an arbitration hearing on the basis of rate of return under subsection (b)(4)(F) below. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Tenants.

(A) Nowithstanding Section 37.3(c)3 Tenants of non-RAP rental units and tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated on or after July 1, 1977 may request arbitration hearings where a landlord has substantially decreased services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law and/or has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant. Burden of proof is on the tenant where a tenant claims one or more of the following:

(i) The landlord seeks a rent increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a).

(ii) The landlord has substantially decreased housing services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law.

(iii) The landlord has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant.

(iv) The landlord is seeking any rent increase after a hearing officer has ordered no increases pursuant to subsection (c)(7) above.

(B) Tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated prior to July 1, 1977 may petition for a hearing where the landlord has noticed an increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. After a vacancy has occurred in a RAP rental unit in said areas, a new tenant of said unit may petition for a hearing where the landlord has demanded and/or received a rent for that unit which exceeds the rent increase limitation set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(e) (f) Procedure for Landlord Petitioners.

(1) Filing. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and shall be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, justification for the proposed rental increase or substantiation of the initial rent charged where new evidence has become available as provided in Section 37.8(e)(1) above. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Filing Date. The petition must be filed prior to the mailing or delivering to the tenant or tenants legal notice of the rental increase exceeding the limitations as defined in Section 37.3.

(3) Effect of Timely Filing of Petition. Provided a completed petition is timely filed, that portion of the requested rental increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 and has not been certified as a justifiable increase in accordance with Section 37.7 is inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the arbitration hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(f) (g) Procedure for Tenant Petitioners.

(1) Filing; Limitation. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and shall be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, a copy of the landlord's notice of rent increase. If the petition is timely filed, the Chief Administrative Officer with respect to base rent and amortization of a RAP loan, such notification must accompany the petition. Tenant petitions regarding the gas and electricity pass-through must be filed within one year of the effective date of the pass-through or within one year of the date the pass-through was required to be recalculated pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated by the Board. This time limit is mandatory and therefore deemed jurisdictional. The burden of proof is on the tenant.

(2) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. Responses to a petition for hearing may be submitted in writing.

(g) (h) Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing must be held within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the petition. The level of housing services provided to tenants' rental units shall not be decreased during the period between the filing of the petition and the conclusion of the hearing.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer: Rental Units. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the landlord's proposed rental increase exceeding the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 is justified or whether or not the landlord has effected a rent increase through a reduction in services or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance as required by state or local law or whether that landlord is receiving a fair rate of return. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the following factors:

(A) Increases or decreases in operating and maintenance expenses, including, but not limited to, real estate taxes, sewer service charges, janitorial service, refuse removal, elevator service, security system, and debt service; provided however, that a unit is purchased after the effective date of this ordinance, and this purchase occurs within two (2) years of the date of the previous purchase, consideration shall not be given to that portion of increased debt service which has resulted from a selling price which exceeds the seller's purchase price by more than the percentage increase in the "Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Labor" between the date of previous purchase and the date of the current sale, plus the cost of capital improvements or rehabilitation work not performed by the seller.

(B) The past history of increases in the rent for the unit and the comparison of the rent for the unit with rents for comparable units in the same general area.

(C) Any findings which have been made pursuant to Section 37.7 with respect to the unit.

(D) Failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement and maintenance in compliance with applicable state and local law.

(E) Prior orders limiting increases pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(7) where the landlord has failed to substantiate the initial rent charged.

(F) The landlord's rate of return.

(G) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in rules and regulations.

(5) Determination of the Hearing Officer: RAP Rental Units.

(A) RAP Rental units in RAP areas designated prior to July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the noticed or proposed rental increase exceeds the rent increase limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall apply the rent increase limitations set forth in
Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and all rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto. The hearing officer shall consider the evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(3) RAP rental units in RAP areas designated on or after July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings with respect to rent increases exceeding the limitations as set forth in Section 37.3 of this Chapter. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the factors set forth in subsection (4) above and shall consider evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(5) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his decision on appeal.

(6) Appeals. The Board shall, in its discretion, hear appeals. In deciding whether or not to hear a given appeal, the Board shall consider, among other factors, fairness to the parties, hardship to either party, and promoting the policies and purposes of this Chapter, in addition to any written comments submitted by the hearing officer whose decision is being challenged. The Board may also review other material from the administrative record of the matter as it deems necessary. A vote of three (3) members shall be required in order for an appeal to be heard.

(4) Remand to Hearing Officer without Appeal. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer has erred, the Board may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its instructions without conducting an appeal hearing. Both parties shall be notified as to the time of the re-hearing, which shall be conducted within thirty (30) days of remanding by the Board. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer's findings contain numerical or clerical inaccuracies, or require clarification, the Board may continue the hearing for purposes of re-referring the case to said hearing officer in order to correct the findings.

(5) Time of Appeal Hearing; Notice to Parties. Appeals accepted by the Board shall be heard within forty-five (45) days of the filing of an appeal. Within thirty (30) days of the filing of an appeal, both parties shall be notified in writing as to whether or not the appeal has been accepted. If the appeal has been accepted, the notice shall state the time of the hearing and the nature of the hearing. Such notice must be mailed at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(6) Appeal Hearing; Decision of the Board. In the appeal hearing, both appellant and respondent shall have an opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents in support of their positions. After such hearing and after any further investigation which the Board may deem necessary the Board may, upon hearing the appeal, affirm, reverse or modify the hearing officer's decision or may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its findings. The Board's decision must be rendered within forty-five (45) days of the hearing and the parties must be notified of such decision.

(7) Notification of the Parties. In accordance with item (6) above, parties shall receive written notice of the decision. The notice shall state that this decision is final.

(8) Effective Date of Appeal Decisions. Appeal decisions are effective on the date mailed to the parties; provided, however, that that portion of any decision which orders payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent shall become effective thirty (30) calendar days after it is mailed to the parties unless a stay of execution is granted by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Limitation of Actions. A landlord or tenant aggrieved by any decision of the Board must seek judicial review within ninety (90) calendar days of the date of mailing of the decision. Sec. 37.10A. Misdeemaneors.

It shall be unlawful for a landlord to increase rent or, rents in violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal pursuant to the hearing and appeal procedures set forth in Section 37.8 of this Chapter. It shall further be unlawful for a landlord to charge an initial rent or any subsequent rent which exceeds the limitations of this Chapter. Any person who increases rents in violation of such decisions or who charges excessive initial rents or excessive subsequent rents shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor hereunder shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $2,000.00 or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six (6) months, or by both. Each violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal as set forth above shall constitute a separate offense. Sec. 37.11A. Civil Actions.

Whenever a landlord fails to comply with the rent disclosure requirements of Section 37.3(e), charges a tenant a rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in this Chapter, or retaliates against a tenant for the exercise of any rights under this Chapter, the tenant may institute a civil proceeding for money damages. A tenant who has been charged an initial rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(d) may, upon prevailing, recover money damages of up to three times actual damages and any other relief the court deems appropriate. The prevailing party in any civil action brought under this Section shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The remedy available under this Section shall be in addition to any other existing remedies which may be available to the tenant.
PROPOSITION N

Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under City law, only certain types of buildings may be converted to condominiums. 40% of the building's tenants must state an intent to buy their units. Conversions are limited to 200 units each year.

Current law gives tenants the first chance to buy the unit and the right to continue to rent for a year if they do not buy. Senior citizens or disabled tenants who do not buy may continue to rent as long as they want, unless lawfully evicted.

Current condominium conversion laws also contain a number of other conditions: The building owner must pay the moving expenses of non-purchasing tenants and must show that the building complies with City codes. The building owner must not have a history of discrimination or illegal evictions. If the 200 unit limit on conversions is changed, the law requires that units classified as low and moderate income rental units be sold at prices affordable to low and moderate income buyers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is an ordinance that would create an additional way to convert rental units to condominiums. There would be no limit on the number of units that could be converted each year under Proposition N or on the types of buildings converted.

Proposition N conversions would be allowed if certain conditions are met: (1) at least 80% of the building is occupied; (2) written notice is given to tenants, explaining their rights under this law; (3) at least 51% of the tenants give written approval; (4) tenants are given first chance to buy their units at a price no greater than 75% of the unit’s value; (5) tenants are offered financing for at least 90% of the unit’s price.

All tenants who do not buy could continue to rent as long as they wanted unless lawfully evicted.

It is unclear whether some sections of current law would apply to Proposition N conversions. These include sections on: moving expenses, tenants’ statements of intent to buy, code compliance, low and moderate income housing, past illegal evictions and discrimination.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

If the proposed Ordinance is approved, in my opinion, it would increase the total property tax revenues of the City and County by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. Additionally, certain permit and inspection services which are presently paid by filing fees for service might increase by an indeterminable amount.

The amount of the potential increase in revenue would depend upon the number of properties converted under provisions in the Ordinance and their respective assessed valuations.

How “N” Got on the Ballot
On August 9, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bill Maher, Jim Gonzalez, Willie B. Kennedy and Tom Hsieh. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Renters’ Choice. The choice to buy a home is part of the American Dream that should not be denied to any San Franciscan. Proposition N allows renters to become home-owners if the landlord and the tenants agree, while protecting tenants who choose to rent, and improving our neighborhoods.

Proposition N is the opportunity for a better San Francisco.

RENTERS WILL BENEFIT

Over the years, monthly rent adds up to a lot of money. Many City residents do not have the large down payment it takes to buy a home in today’s market, and find themselves trapped in this expensive renting cycle. Home ownership provides financial security and stability.

With Proposition N, renters will have the opportunity to purchase their apartments from the owner at 75 percent of market value (determined by an independent appraiser), with no more than a 10 percent down payment. The owner will arrange for the financing. Fifty one percent of the building’s renters must agree to purchase, and residents who choose to rent are protected by rent control laws for the rest of their lives.

Proposition N is by and for the renters of San Francisco.

OUR CITY WILL BENEFIT

As renters become home owners, the sales transactions will generate property tax revenue for San Francisco. Proposition N will increase revenue to support important City services such as health care, MUNI, police and fire protection, and will improve our quality of life at no cost to the general public.

Proposition N is a good deal on both sides of the handshake.

Vote Yes for Renter’s Choice.

Vote Yes for new home ownership opportunities in San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

John Eaton
President, Renters for Home Ownership

Nicole Sanahara
Vice-President, Renters for Home Ownership

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

There is a major eviction loophole in this Initiative. Because of recently enacted State law, the lifetime leases the proponents guarantee are not solely a matter of local control and cannot be relied upon.

Who would argue with the idea of tenants “owning” their own homes? All of us support home ownership. But in a city where the average price for a condominium is over $250,000, affordability is a critical concern.

The new system proposed by Proposition N was actually tried in San Francisco over 10 years ago.

All of the benefits touted by the sponsors of Proposition N were part of that system.

How did it work out?

89% of all the tenants in buildings that were converted did not become homeowners.

Only 11% of the people who signed intents to purchase actually bought their homes.

That’s why San Francisco adopted an ordinance limiting the number of rental units converted to condominiums to 200 annually. Proposition N would abolish this limit.

It will benefit a handful of people who might purchase their units at $150,000 – $200,000 and then turn around and sell their units at $200,000 – $265,000. This is one of the serious flaws in Proposition N.

Nothing in Proposition N guarantees real, long-term affordability. Proposition N is bad public policy. I urge you to vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

This is a Reagan-like de-regulation of a system that works just fine. Proposition N would deregulate the condominium conversion process. Condo developers would be allowed to convert an unlimited number of apartments to more expensive condominiums.

The City’s current law allows up to 200 rental units per year to be converted to condominiums. Enacted in 1982, it represented a compromise between “free market” advocates who were willing to accept the loss of 500 – 1000+ rental units a year and housing/community advocates seeking to ban conversions altogether. That compromise has worked.

Proposition N sets up a second, brand-new conversion process that allows an unlimited number of conversions. It’s effectively a repeal of the current annual limit. Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned a study of condo conversions that took place before we had a limit: 89% of the tenants in converted buildings were displaced by conversion. They did not become homeowners.

Finally, the much touted tenant protections and affordability provisions of Proposition N are either the same or similar to current City law, or in some cases, significantly weaker.

Unlimited condo conversions are a bad deal for San Francisco. Vote no on Proposition N.

Mayor Art Agnos

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Mayor Agnos, you are fortunate enough to own your own home. All we renters want is the same choice you had when you became part of the American Dream of home ownership.

You’re wrong when you say that the present system works “just fine.”

The City’s current system is faulty because it is landlord driven. Under the “annual limit” law you support, renters are being displaced, which is nothing to brag about.

PROPOSITION N IS TENANT DRIVEN — IT GUARANTEES THAT NO TENANT CAN BE DISPLACED.

All San Franciscans should have the opportunity to become a home owner. The argument for an “annual limit” in the number of renters buying a home translates shamefully into “I’ve got mine.”

FOR EVERY APARTMENT THAT IS PURCHASED, RENTERS BECOME HOMEOWNERS, PROPOSITION N MEETS THE NEED FOR HOME OWNERSHIP.

Current City laws do not provide sufficient protections or affordability safeguards for renters. PROPOSITION N ALLOWS RENTERS TO BENEFIT FROM A DISCOUNT OF 25% OFF EACH UNIT AND LOW DOWN PAYMENTS.

Proposition N will generate desperately needed revenue for important City services. HOME OWNERSHIP BUILDS STRONGER COMMUNITIES AND CIVIC PRIDE.

We speak as the renters of San Francisco — 70% of the City’s population. We want opportunities for affordable home ownership. We are young couples, families, single-income renters. We are hard-working San Franciscans — we are not politicians. When the majority of the residents here cannot afford to buy a home, the system is not working.

John Eaton
Nico Sunahara
Renters for Home Ownership

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Yes on Proposition N. Vote for affordable homeownership.
Proposition N is a win-win proposition. It allows tenants in
buildings where a majority of renters wish to buy, to become
homeowners. It protects those who do not wish to buy with lifetime
leases. Proposition N results in new revenue for city services.
Protect tenants — provide homeownership opportunities —
fund important city services.
Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Homeownership is the American ideal. Recent polls show more
than 50% of San Franciscans want to own their own home.
Proposition N, The Home Ownership Initiative, is the first real
attempt in twenty years to create significant new affordable home
ownership opportunities in San Francisco.
Proposition N will allow that. For years our city’s policies have
been anti-home ownership. City Hall has taken the cavalier attitude
that if you’re middle class and want to own a home, you will just
have to leave town. We have adopted policy after policy preventing
meaningful affordable home ownership opportunities. Proposition N
allows renters to buy their homes at affordable prices.
Proposition N requires that a majority of the tenants agree in
writing to the choice of purchasing their own units.
Proposition N requires that if the landlord decides to sell, he must
offer tenants their units at no more than 75% of their market value
and at 90% financing — a huge savings to tenants.
Proposition N guarantees long term leases for any tenants who
choose not to purchase. Those who choose to continue renting are
protected for life.
It has been suggested that this will reduce rentals in the City. Isn’t
it far better to allow people to own their own homes than to force
them to rent forever or else leave town? Shouldn’t we be proud to
have a goal of a City where the majority of its residents own their
homes? Proposition N will triple the number of San Franciscans
who can own their own homes while protecting its renters.

Not one person will be evicted because of Proposition N.
Please join me and many thousands of San Franciscans in making
affordable home ownership a reality.
Vote yes on Proposition N.

Supervisor Bill Maher

As an architect, and Member of the Board of Supervisors, I have
been involved in creating affordable housing for San Franciscans
for decades.
Proposition N is creative and fair housing legislation that will
keep our City livable and economically sound.
Proposition N will allow average income San Franciscans in an
apartment building to democratically and economically purchase
individual apartments from their landlord. Renters who choose not
to buy get lifetime leases.
Existing laws already protect low income rental units from being
affected by this new law — so, Proposition N works for the com-
mon good of all San Franciscans.
Proposition N is good public policy.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The way things are now in our City, working people, paying rent
in very expensive apartments for years and years end up with
nothing to show for it.
Many are forced to move to distant suburbs and towns to find
home ownership opportunities.
Its time to be creative and provide NEW opportunities for
first-time home buyers. Proposition N allows folks to buy their
units at a discount, low down payment, and landlords have to help
finance the purchase.
Renters that do not choose to buy get lifetime leases.
Proposition N will help middle income San Franciscans achieve
the American Dream.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

After being a renter here in San Francisco for over ten years, this
opportunity to become a home owner seems like the light at the
end of the tunnel. Prop N would give us a choice to either buy or
continue renting and the fact that nobody can be displaced is very
comforting to everyone concerned.
Give us all the unique chance to make our own decisions to either
become home owners or remain as renters by voting Yes on N.

Hedwig Montalvo

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

Proposition N is a win-win proposal for renters and the City. Homeownership creates more involved and dedicated San Franciscans who will participate in the progress of our community.

Homeownership increases the City’s tax base which provides more funds for public amenities and human services.

Proposition N creates new opportunities for homeownership while strictly protecting the City’s affordable housing stock.

Proposition N provides lifetime leases for renters that do not buy their units.

What could be more fair? Vote Yes on Prop. N.

Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

As a San Francisco small business owner for over 35 years, I have witnessed first hand how home ownership builds strong neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, the price of a home has risen so much that most renters have no hope of owning their own home in the City. So, these renters choose the only option open to them: they leave the City, and buy in the suburbs.

I support Proposition N because I want to create real, new home ownership opportunities for first-time San Francisco home buyers. It’s time we stop driving the middle class out of San Francisco. Please join me in giving renters the choices they need to buy homes in San Francisco. Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Mike Salerno

While you can pick up the newspaper and find hundreds of rentals in all price ranges, it is impossible to find a house or condominium that is affordable to the average person in this City. This is more than a crisis, it is a disgrace.

Prop N is about our lives and the lives of thousands of renters who dream of becoming home owners, without having to move out of San Francisco. Prop N is a winning proposition for the renter and for the City of San Francisco. Vote YES on N!

George Polley

Under the Renter’s Choice Initiative, Proposition N, renters can purchase the apartments they live in when the owner and more than one-half of the current tenants in the building agree to a conversion.

The proposition will have significant financial benefits to the renter/homeowner, the City’s fiscal health and to the City’s economy in general, including:

A. BENEFITS TO TENANT/HOMEOWNER
1. Reduction in income taxes due to the deduction of mortgage interest and real property taxes.
2. Reduction in periodic payroll withholding tax due to a reduction of income taxes.
3. The tenant/homeowner can fix his housing expense and may have greater spendable income which may increase with time by obtaining a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

B. BENEFITS TO CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1. Increased transfer tax revenue due to the purchase of apartment units by the tenant.
2. Increased property tax revenue due to the higher real property valuation resulting from individual ownership of apartment units.
3. Increased sales and use tax revenue as a result of consumption by new homeowners who may have more after-tax spendable income.
4. Help balance the City’s budget by increasing tax revenues to the City.

C. SAN FRANCISCO’S ECONOMY AND BUSINESS CLIMATE
When more people become homeowners in the City, the homeowners’ long-term financial stability is enhanced. They also have major tax deductions which they would not have as renters. These factors may translate into more spendable after tax income which strengthens the local economy and encourages investment.

Bruce A. Miller
Kenneth Leventhal & Company
Certified Public Accountants

While well-off homeowners are able to build up equity, enjoy mortgage payments that don’t increase every year (as rent does!), and savor the satisfaction of owning their own homes, tenants have none of these opportunities.

Help to reverse this trend by allowing everybody to buy a home and keep San Franciscans here who would otherwise be forced to move out. Vote Yes on Prop N.

Ivan Kinkennon

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

It would be a tragedy if San Francisco were to let itself go the way of too many other large cities in which home ownership is only the right of the extremely rich and the subsidized poor. It is the middle-income workers like myself and my neighbors who pay the taxes that support subsidized housing and who underwrite the lives of the wealthy. As middle-income residents leave for the suburbs in search of the homes they are denied here, the city suffers — in a loss of diversity, a loss of tax revenue, and a loss of will, frankly. This town will become like too many others, a city of extreme wealth and extreme poverty — with no one left to foot the bill. Vote Yes on N.

John George Bilotta

Home ownership is a prime opportunity that many San Francisco citizens cannot achieve without Prop N. This legislation is fair, honest and provides numerous safeguards to protect renters. Taxes generated by home sales will create funds for the City’s health, fire and police protection. Prop N is a good deal for San Francisco. Please vote yes on Prop N.

Stanley DeSouza

I urge you to vote in favor of Prop N, thus giving the opportunity of home ownership to many people who will otherwise be forced to eventually buy homes out of the City and commute in and out of town to their workplace. I’ve rented in the same apartment complex for over 14 years and welcome this opportunity. Vote Yes on N!

Gladys Messersmith

Rent increases, unreasonable landlords, poor maintenance ... I hate being a renter! Without Proposition N, I would never have the opportunity to own my home in San Francisco. I urge every voter who has paid enough in monthly rent to buy their apartments ten times over, but can’t come up with the hefty down payment needed to buy a home, to vote YES on N.

Kris Matsuyama

THANK YOU Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh, Kennedy, and Maher for standing up for the “underdog” renters. It’s about time that City Hall started thinking about practical legislation to deal with the problem of affordable housing for the people who live and work in San Francisco.

Erika K. Pringsheim

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Allowing more apartments to become condominiums reduces rental housing, driving up rents for 70% of San Franciscans unable to purchase a home. Protect rental housing. Vote No on N!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Prop N will deplete the number of rent-controlled apartments by allowing more units to “go condo” each year. We say: Look for ways to build new housing, but don’t take away the few affordable units we have!

Vote NO on N!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
St. Peter’s Housing Committee

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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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N’s “eviction protections” don’t kick in until after the building is converted to condominiums, when it’s too late. The developers will get rid of tenants who don’t “cooperate” and rent to only upscale tenants who can afford to buy expensive condos and then convert. That’s what they used to do and they will do it again under Prop. N.

Proposition N is merely a loophole in the condo conversion law designed to help landlords and developers make a quick profit. All the real renters organizations oppose this fraud.

No on N!

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Community Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition

We’ve all been victims of the phony “sale” price. You know, the kind where you think you got a great deal. Then you find out that first they inflated the regular price, then they gave you the “discount”. You still end up paying way too much.

That’s how Prop N works. First they double or triple the value of the apartment by converting it to a condo. Then they offer the “discount” on the inflated price! Then they “offer” you financing with a big balloon payment in five years! Thanks, but no thanks.

Don’t be a victim of a phoney fast-talking sales pitch. Vote no on N.

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Tenants Union

They promise lifetime leases to tenants who don’t buy. But they forgot about State law. When those condominiums are sold, the new owners will use Gov. Code Sec. 7060 et Seq. to remove their condo from rental use, evicting the tenants with “lifetime” leases. And it’s all perfectly legal because State law overrides City law.

Completely unlimited condo conversions, loss of affordable apartments, useless “lifetime” leases? Say no to “N”.

Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Terence Hallinan

You don’t have to go far to see why Proposition N won’t work. For four years San Francisco operated under a law that was virtually identical to Prop. N. Most of its provisions — including the tenants’ “agreement” to conversion and protections for tenants who don’t buy — were adopted in 1979 and are still on the books.

Unfortunately, without a reasonable annual limit on conversions, the law just doesn’t work.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned the only comprehensive study of condominium conversions ever done in San Francisco.

The startling conclusion: 89% of the original tenants in converted buildings were evicted or otherwise displaced by the conversion, despite all the Prop. N style protections.

Prop. N means unlimited conversions. Don’t turn the clock back ten years or more. Vote No on N.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

Proposition N is what gives SOME landlords and SOME supervisors a bad name. San Francisco’s condominium conversion law is a Board of Supervisors ordinance, not enacted by initiative. Proposition N, however, is an initiative propounded by ONLY 4 members of the Board of Supervisors (Hsieh, Maher, Kennedy, Gonzalez) and not even by the number of registered voters’ signatures required to qualify an initiative by petition. If enacted, Proposition N will be inflexible and impervious to change except by another costly ballot measure. Proposition N shouldn’t be on the ballot; it’s bad government, wrought by the ultimate selfish special interest, and the San Francisco Taxpayers Association strongly urges its rejection.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Don’t be fooled by the condominium developers. San Francisco already has a law that:

• Prevents conversions in buildings where there have been any evictions for the purposes of converting in the 18 months before the conversion (not just after the conversion when it’s too late like Prop. N)
• Guarantees senior citizens and permanently disabled tenants life-time leases
• Guarantees rents for those who remain in the building are covered by rent control

What are the condominium developers up to?
Proposition N would effectively repeal the current limit of 200 conversions a year and allow a completely unlimited number effective immediately!

The results of Mayor Feinstein’s Condominium conversion study are clear: Proposition N will result in 89% of the tenants in the buildings being converted being moved out.

Don’t be fooled by phony discounts on inflated prices. We urge you to vote no on Prop. N.

Assemblyman John Burton

Another Bad idea from four politicians looking for easy campaign contributions. Don’t let the real estate industry hijack our city to the land of condemnations. Vote No on N.

David C. Spero

Proposition N is the most blatant example of a greedy special interest measure on this year’s municipal election ballot. It represents the epitome of stealthy manipulation of Board of Supervisor members to accommodate CERTAIN landlords. Moreover, its very provisions were invalidly revised AFTER it was submitted to the Registrar of Voters by a wealthy property owner. I’m voting NO on it and I urge other voters to do the same.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

The San Francisco Democratic Party urges you to vote NO on Proposition N.
Many San Franciscans cannot afford to buy a home. The effect of this proposition is to shrink the availability of rental housing and force San Francisco rental and home ownership costs even higher. The average home in San Francisco sells for over $350,000. This proposition would require a prospective homebuyer to provide a $35,000 down payment, far more than most San Franciscans can afford.

Say no to the “Realtors Profit” proposition. Vote NO on Proposition N.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O’Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Bieman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaick, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Catherine J. Dodd RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco, that:

RENTER’S CHOICE MEASURE: HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XIII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (SUBDIVISION CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 1396 THEREOF TO CREATE HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES BY CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS AND ADDING SECTION 1396b THERETO TO EXEMPT FROM THE CONVERSION LIMITATIONS OF SECTION 1396 THE CONVERSION OF APARTMENT UNITS IN ANY APARTMENT BUILDINGS WHERE MORE THAN HALF OF THE TENANTS AGREE TO THE CONVERSION, MAKING FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE EXEMPTION, AND AMENDING CHAPTER 37 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 37 OF THEREOF TO PROVIDE THAT LANDLORDS MAY NOT EVICT TENANTS FROM UNITS CONVERTED TO CONDOMINIUMS UNDER SUBDIVISION CODE SECTION 1396b ON THE GROUND THAT THE LANDLORD OR A RELATIVE DESIRES TO OCCUPY THE UNIT.

Section 1. Findings.
In the 1980’s, there was a dramatic inflation in real estate prices in San Francisco. During this decade, the increase in median home price far exceeded the increased in the median household income for the City. This widening gap between home prices and incomes has placed the benefits of home ownership beyond the reach of a majority of San Francisco households. The inflation in real estate prices has virtually excluded first-time home buyers from the housing market and has made it extremely difficult for expanding families who have recently purchased a home from trading up to a larger home more suitable to the needs of a larger family.

The City should expand the opportunities for owner-occupancy of housing and develop efficient programs to facilitate home ownership for households of varied income levels. The conversion of rental apartments to condominiums is a potential source of affordable owner-occupied housing. However, condominium conversions must balance the need for home ownership against the goal of avoiding displacement of tenants.

These amendments balance such goals by providing affordable home ownership opportunities through regulations which will allow the sale of residential units at below-market prices with low down payments, and will not displace tenants who do not elect to purchase their units. The program will also provide financial and other benefits to the City by creating stable long-term residents, increasing the City’s real estate tax base and providing additional revenue from transfer taxes.

Under these regulations, complete applications for conversion of apartment buildings will be accepted on a first-come, first serve basis. Buildings will be eligible for conversion when, among other things:

(a) 50% of the residential units in the building are occupied at the time of filing the application and not less than 51% of the tenants have approved in writing of the conversion.

(b) The subdivider shall have obtained and furnished to each tenant a copy of an independent appraisal of the market value of each unit.

(c) NO TENANT SHALL BE EVICTED OR IN VOLUNTARILY RELOCATED BECAUSE OF THE SALE OF UNITS, AND ANY TENANT WHO DOES NOT ELECT TO PURCHASE HIS OR HER UNIT MAY BE EXTENDED A LIFE TIME LEASE WITH FULL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES UNDER THE CITY’S RENT CONTROL ORDINANCES. In addition the proposed regulations provide that upon the death of an elderly non-purchasing tenant, the unit may be leased by the other’s spouse or domestic partner of the deceased with the same privileges.

(d) The cost associated with conversion or code compliance may not be passed on to the tenants or purchasers of the units.

(e) Within a year of issuance of the Department of Real Estate public report tenants will be offered the right to purchase their unit for not more than 75% of the fair market value (as determined by current appraisal) as of the date of filing the application.

(f) To each tenant’s purchase of the unit, the subdivider shall cause to be offered to the tenant financing in an amount, as elected by the tenant, of at least 90% of the purchase price. At least 90% of the principal amount of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of 25 years and the balance of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of five years. The fixed or variable interest rate, loan fees and closing costs on all such financing shall be no higher than that offered by the Bank of America at a 25 year fixed or variable home mortgage in equivalent amount.

(g) Tenants who purchase their units must represent in writing that such units will be used as a residence for not less than 12 months; and

(h) No landlord may evict the tenant because of the landlord’s desire to occupy or have a relative occupy the tenants unit.

... Section 2; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by amending Section 1396 thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 1396. ANNUAL CONVERSION LIMITATION. This section governing annual limitation shall apply only to conversion of residential units.

Subject to the provisions of Section 1396b, applications for conversions of residential units, whether vacant or occupied, shall not be accepted by the Department of Public Works during the period of January 1, 1990 – December 31, 1993, inclusive, except that a maximum of 200 units, as selected yearly by lottery by the Department of Public Works from all eligible applicants, may be approved for conversion per year during the aforementioned period for the following categories of buildings:

(a) Buildings consisting of four units or less in which one of the units has been occupied continuously by one of the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(b) Buildings consisting of six units or less in which 50 percent or more of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(c) Community apartments as defined in Section 1308 of this Code, which, on or before December 31, 1982, met the criteria for community apartments in Section 1308 of this code and which were approved as a subdivision by the Department of Public Works on or before December 31, 1982, and where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

The conversion of a stock cooperative as defined in Section 1308 of this Code to condominiums shall be exempt from the annual limitation imposed on the number of conversions in this Section and from the requirement to be selected by lottery where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

No application for conversions of a residential building submitted by a registrant shall be approved by the Department of Public Works to fill the unused portion of the 200 unit annual limitation for the previous year.

The provision of this Section shall become effective on January 1, 1990.

Section 3; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by adding Section 1396b thereto, to read as follows:

Sec. 1396b. CONVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS WITH APPROVAL OF MAJORITY OF TENANTS — NO EVCTIONS

(a) Notwithstanding Section 1396 of this Code, from and after the effective date of this Section, the Department of Public Works shall accept on a first-come, first-served basis (as hereinafter set forth) completed applications for conversion to condominiums of residential apartments, where no less than 80% of the residential units in such buildings are occupied at the time of the filing of the application. Buildings converted under this Section must meet the conditions of the following Subsections (b) through (g). For purposes of this Section, a "building" shall include an apart-

(Continued on next page)
ment complex under a single ownership or approved as a single development. Applications for conversion under this Section shall be approved on a first-come, first-served basis among applicants who have submitted complete applications, which applications shall be deemed complete when the conditions of the following subsections (b) through (g) have been met. The Department of Public Works shall approve a completed application which complies with all the provisions hereof within six months of filing of such application or such application shall be deemed approved.

(b) The subdivider shall (i) give written notice of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants provided in this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (ii) provide to the tenant an appraisal of the fair market value of each tenant's unit as of a date not more than 90 days prior to the filing of a complete application. The fair market value shall be determined by an independent appraiser by a licensed Member of the American Appraisal Institute paid for by the subdivider.

(c) Within five days of filing an application for a Tentative Map with the Department of Public Works for conversion of a building under this Section, (i) the subdivider shall give written notice (by certified or registered mail) a return receipt requested of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants provided in this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (ii) the proposed conversion shall be approved in writing by not less than 51 percent of the tenants of the building. The provisions of Section 1388 of this code shall also apply to conversions under this Section.

(d) No tenant on the date of filing of the application or, in the event of a voluntary vacation or eviction for cause, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report, shall be evicted or involuntarily relocated as a result of a conversion under this Section. The lease of any tenant who does not elect to purchase his or her unit shall be extended until the death of such tenant or until the tenant vacates the unit, either voluntarily or as the result of a lawful eviction. A non-purchasing tenant who elects to remain in his or her unit shall be the subject to the same rights and privileges as are applicable under any lease to the unit until the expiration of such lease and thereafter under Administrative Code Chapter 37. The provisions of Section 1391 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section. None of the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures required under the City's Housing, Building, or City Planning Codes for the filling of a Final Map may be passed through to the tenants in the form of a rent increase under Administrative Code Section 37.7. Upon the death of any non-purchasing tenant aged 62 or older occupying a unit converted to a condominium under this Section, any surviving spouse or domestic partner (as defined in the San Francisco Municipal Code) who was a member of such tenant's household within one month prior to the death of the tenant shall be entitled to all the rights of a tenant in such unit under this Section and under Administrative Code Chapter 37.

(e) Within one year of the issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report for any building converted to condominiums under this Section, the subdivider shall offer in writing to each tenant at the date of filing of the application (or, in the event such tenant voluntarily vacates or is evicted for cause before the issuance of the Public Report, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the Public Report) a nontransferable right to purchase the unit occupied by such tenant. The price offered by the Subdivider for such unit shall be no more than 75 percent of the fair market value of such unit as of the date of filing of the application. Such offer may not be extended by the subdivider to the tenant before the recordation of the Final Map or Parcel Map and the issuance of the Public Report. Such right to purchase shall extend for 90 days from the date the subdivider first offers the unit to the tenant. The period for acceptance of the offer may be extended by an agreement in writing between the subdivider and tenant. The tenant may cancel his or her agreement to purchase the unit if title to the unit is not conveyed to the tenant within six months of a written agreement to purchase the unit. The provisions of Section 1387 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section.

(f) To finance the purchase of each tenant of the unit occupied, the subdivider shall cause to be offered financing to be provided to each tenant from either a conventional lending institution or purchase money financing from the subdivider in an amount, at the election of the tenant, of at least 90 percent of the purchase price for the unit. Such financing shall be secured by one or more deeds of trust on the unit. Ninety percent of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of 25 years, and the balance of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of five years. All such financing shall be subject to a fixed or variable rate of interest, loan fee, and closing costs no higher than the rates offered by the Bank of America for a 25-year fixed or variable home mortgage for a loan of an amount equivalent to the amount to be financed at the time the tenant accepts the subdivider's offer. Tenants shall not be required to accept such financing as a condition of purchase.

(g) Before the transfer of title to any unit converted under this Section, the subdivider shall submit to the City's Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Surveys and Mapping Division, the following for each unit:

(1) Copies of the notices of the proposed conversion given in accordance with Subsections (b) and (g) and a representation under penalty of perjury that the notices were timely provided to the tenant occupying the unit;

(2) A copy of the subdivider's offer to sell the unit to the tenant in accordance with Subsection (e), including a statement of the price and the terms of financing offered to the tenant;

(3) A copy of the appraisal of the unit;

(4) With respect to units whose tenants elect not to purchase, the subdivider's certification (sworn under penalty of perjury) and return receipt for the notice described in Subsection (b) above, evidencing that each such tenant has been informed in writing of their rights under this Section, including the rights to purchase the unit at 75 percent of its fair market value and to receive financing arranged by the subdivider on the terms set forth in Subsections (e) and (f);

(5) With respect to units whose tenants elect to purchase, a letter from the tenant stating the sale price of the unit, the amount of the down payment, the terms of the financing, and a representation under penalty of perjury that such unit will be used as the principal residence of such tenant for a period of not less than twelve months following the date of transfer of title;

(6) Such information as are required under Section 1381 of this Code.

Section 4. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 37.9(a), (b), and (c) thereof, to read as follows:

Sec. 37.9 Evictions. Notwithstanding Section 37.3, this Section shall apply as of August 24, 1980, to all landlords and tenants of rental units as defined in Section 37.2(a). A landlord shall not endeavor to recover possession of a rental unit unless:

... (A) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit on or before the thirtieth day after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without illtiter reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use of occupancy as his or her own principal residence, or for the use as occupancy as the principal residence of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, or the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 10 percent interest in the property. A landlord may not recover possession under this subsection if a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It

(Continued on next page)
shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or

(B) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit more than 30 days after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without ulterior reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use or occupancy as his or her principal resident of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, of the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 25 percent interest in the property. A landlord may not recover possession under the subsection if a comparable unit on the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy. If a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy. If comparable unit does become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B, it being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of desire to occupy such unit by landlord or landlord's relative; or

(9) The landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith in order to sell the unit in accordance with a condominium conversion approved under the San Francisco subdivision ordinance and does so without ulterior reasons and with honest intent. This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B; it being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of landlord's desire to sell the unit or to have the unit occupied by another person.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We the people of the City and County of San Francisco reaffirm our unqualified support for the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States which reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

We hold that these provisions, particularly as they relate to freedom of expression, are absolute and without exception. We oppose any and all efforts of government, at any level, to regulate or restrict the content of the print, broadcast, and electronic media; the visual and performing arts; music; or any other form of speech. We call upon the State of California and the Government of the United States to cease and desist all acts of censorship. We also call upon the City and County of San Francisco to cease and desist all efforts to restrict freedom of expression and ask that no city funds be used in a manner contrary to the spirit of this initiative.

We ordain that the community standards of the City and County of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance, and the rejection of every form of censorship.

NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?
Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.
PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City's unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Freedom of expression is protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and by the California Constitution.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to affirm San Francisco's unqualified support of the First Amendment. The measure says that the people of San Francisco oppose all government efforts to regulate or restrict any form of expression. Proposition O calls on the federal, state and City governments to stop all efforts to restrict freedom of expression. The measure asks that no City funds be used contrary to the spirit of this measure.

The measure states that the community standards of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance and the rejection of every form of censorship.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this policy about freedom of expression.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "O"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How "O" Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

8,398 valid signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 22, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,500 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,101 more than the required number of signatures.
PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Our nation's Founders wisely wrote a Constitution to limit government power. Just in case they hadn't made it clear enough that government powers must be strictly limited, they added a Bill of Rights specifically forbidding government from infringing on certain important liberties.

The First Amendment protects freedom of speech and the press. The Founders made clear that the Constitution forbade government from infringing on any speech or publication. James Madison, considered the Father of the Constitution wrote, "Is then the federal government destitute of every authority for restraining the licentiousness of the press? . . . the answer must be, that the federal government is destitute of all such authority." George Hay, a U.S. District Attorney, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and later a Federal Judge, in 1799 said, "If the words 'freedom of the press' have any meaning at all they mean a total exemption from any law making any publication whatever criminal."

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "No definite line can be drawn between the inestimable liberty of the press and its demoralizing licentiousness. If there is still impropriety . . . its supplement must be sought in the censorship of public opinion." Or, if you are offended by it, don't buy it. The Founders wisely left the decision about what publications should be read up to the individual reader. The First Amendment protects your right to decide what you will or will not read. By voting "Yes" you reaffirm your right to make your own decisions about what you will read.

On this 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights reaffirm your support for this important document. Rights are not determined by majority vote, nor should they be, but a reaffirmation of freedom is always needed.

John Whisman, Co-Chair

Maria Pinto, Co-Chair

First Amendment Coalition

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

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

We marvel as the Soviet people struggle to attain the basic rights that Americans have been guaranteed for 200 years under the Bill of Rights. Ironically, so accustomed are we to these freedoms, we also risk losing them bit by bit. Recently, we have seen the erosion of free speech from government-censored Persian Gulf war coverage to Mapplethorpe to rap music. The Soviets have shown themselves to be willing to fight for freedom of expression. We should do no less. Defend your constitutional rights. Vote "Yes." Let freedom ring!

Greg Vogel  
Business Consultant  
George Meyer, member  
American Civil Liberties Union

We must not trust government to determine the morality of speech or action. Contrary to the language and the spirit of the First Amendment, the Supreme Court, and lower courts, have determined that there are ideas and opinions that should be suppressed. The Court ruled that "community standards" can be an excuse to make exceptions to the First Amendment. Let's establish a standard in our community opposing all forms of censorship. Vote "Yes".

Glenn Cripe  
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Government regulation of speech results in intellectual stagnation. Court rooms and prisons become the garbage heap of unpopular ideas or images. But these ideas or images force a society to ponder, to look at itself critically, to find truth, and create a better world in which to live. Freedom of expression is an inalienable individual right, as our Founders clearly recognized; those who want to restrict it, no matter what their excuses, oppose freedom.

Proposition "O" will remind the government and the citizenry that the First Amendment is the law. Supreme Courts and Attorney Generals may come and go, but the First Amendment must be preserved.

Jeffrey Jones  
Californians Against Censorship Together

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; our Constitution was devised to protect these rights against government repression, by ascribing limited and clearly delineated powers. The intent of the First Amendment is to prevent government interference with individual freedom of thought and conscience. Today, the First Amendment is under attack from those whose intent is to impose their views on others. Proposition "O" supports, "without exception", the First Amendment as the absolute law of the land, and says our government must cease breaking the law. Send a clear message that America's tradition of liberty is alive in San Francisco. Vote "Yes".

Mark Valverde

The Voter Pamphlet is [CENSORED].

City Attorney Renne has gotten local court authorization to censor dozens of ballot arguments — anything judged to be "false", "misleading" or "irrelevant".

Last time Mayor Agnos tried to deal land near City College to a profiteering developer, a ballot argument was censored because it mentioned the $60,000 Agnos once "forgot" to pay taxes on, as proving Agnos untrustworthy.

Renne’s rationale was that improprieties in Agnos’ past were irrelevant.

She’s entitled to her opinion.

But the government should have no right to censor its critics.

The idea of elections is for the voters to decide.

Print all opinions in the Voter Pamphlet.

Vote yes.

Grassroots

Send Jesse Helms a message that the First Amendment is alive and well in 1991. As we just saw in the Rust v. Sullivan decision, the First Amendment is being threatened. It is unacceptable for the Federal government to issue a gag rule attacking the right of a physician to counsel on abortion and to use the withdrawal of federal funds as an economic hammer against free speech. Vote "yes".

Mayor Art Agnos
First Amendment

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Two centuries ago, pornography was legal throughout the country.
But between the mid-1800s and mid-1900s, laws were passed against “vices” — abortion, gambling, alcohol, marijuana — including “obscenity”.
And, after being sold legally for a century, Fanny Hill was banned.
Now the tide has turned. Fanny Hill is no longer illegal. But people still get arrested for selling books and films.
Nowadays it’s legal to do most of the things it used to be illegal to even write about.
We have the right to take part in orgies — but not videotape them!
Pornography doesn’t spread AIDS.
If America can tolerate sexual freedom in real life, we can tolerate it in literature and film.
Bring back the First Amendment. Vote yes.

Grassroots

Art does not flourish through censorship. Freedom of expression dies when an artist’s First Amendment rights are denied. This has a chilling effect that imprisons the thoughts of the artist and encourages self-censorship out of fear; this will be felt for generations to come. Allowing books to be banned, records to be burned, or artists to be harassed and arrested for creating their own concept of art destroys a vital part of our society.
Keep the arts and all forms of expression alive and free. Vote “Yes”.

Maria Pinto
The Avant Garde Society

If you knew what gets censored — you’d be surprised.
For instance, it’s illegal for California political parties to announce positions on “non-partisan” elections.
This ridiculous law has never been enforced — except by City Attorney Renne, who used it as authority to censor candidate statements in the Voter Pamphlet.
The federal appeals court ruled this is an abridgement of free speech. The Supreme Court later voided that ruling on a technicality. So Renne’s censorship has been ruled unconstitutional, but the law and her policy are still on the books.
Tell the City Attorney to stop acting like the City Censor. Vote yes.

Grassroots

Nowadays, 90% of all “obscene” materials are legal.
Only “hard-core” is still denied freedom of press.
What’s the difference?
It’s supposed to be “community standards”.
But laws should have objective standards.
How can record stores and museums know which music and art is illegal? As Supreme Court Justice Stewart stated in Jacobellis vs. Ohio (1964): “I know it when I see it.”
Naturally, juries may be biased. “Community standards” become double standards.
Nobody should have the right to impose their biases on others. Our community standard should be:
LIVE AND LET LIVE; READ AND LET READ.
Vote yes.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition O

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

PROPOSITION P
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: From 1980 to 1989, an experimental program in California allowed physicians to prescribe hemp (marijuana) for certain medical purposes. State law no longer allows hemp to be used for medical purposes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P would make it City policy to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines. This measure defines "hemp medical preparations" as all products made from hemp, cannabis, or marijuana that are intended for the treatment of disease, the relief of pain, or for any other healing purpose. This measure calls for physicians to be allowed to prescribe hemp for medical purposes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this declaration of policy about hemp medical preparations.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “P”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition P:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How “P” Got on the Ballot
On July 29, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition P to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 19, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,620 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,221 more than the required number of signatures.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

When the law unnecessarily interferes with good medical practice, everyone suffers.

Medical patients who become aware that the most effective and benign agent for treating their condition is legally unavailable are forced to choose between recovery and breaking the law. According to the National Cancer Institute, one third of cancer patients receiving chemotherapy decide to discontinue potentially life-saving or life-prolonging treatments because of severe and debilitating side effects which could be greatly reduced by a medicine which is legally forbidden. Otherwise law-abiding patients who choose to obtain this medicine, or family members or friends who do this for them, are forced to break the law and pay extremely inflated prices on the black market. When all their physical and emotional resources should be devoted to recovery, they are burdened with additional stress and anxiety through fear of prosecution.

Sincere and informed physicians and other medical personnel are forced to choose between their medical oath and a cruel law which prohibits them from giving the best medical advice and treatment to their patients.

Conscientious and informed law enforcement personnel are forced to choose between human decency and compassion, or duty, which requires them to interfere in medical practices in which they are not competent to make decisions.

Particularly during the past decade, the people of San Francisco have courageously borne a terrible burden as we have watched so many of our loved ones suffer and die. Much of this suffering and death is needless and could be prevented. Your vote in favor of Proposition P will send a message to all of California and the nation that we believe medical decisions are best left to qualified physicians and their patients.

Earl Galvin
Martin Kahn

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition P
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition P

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

I am a woman born with various disabilities and have tried numerous pain medications. All have caused severe vomiting, nausea, allergies and diarrhea. I have found that smoking marijuana is the one thing that keeps me out of emergency and helps to relieve the pain so that I can sleep. Marijuana also helps to stimulate my appetite so that I am able to eat.

Proposition P is a step toward helping me and others in similar circumstances stay alive. Please vote in favor of Prop P and help those who cannot take other medications.

Mary Gennoy

I am not a criminal, simply a person with AIDS. To relieve some life threatening symptoms I smoke marijuana. Fear grips me every time I am forced to buy on the black market — at exorbitant prices. Please help me to obtain legal marijuana. VOTE YES ON THE MEDICAL MARIJUANA INITIATIVE. It makes sense and is compassionate and necessary.

Rick Gilberg

Proposition P advises restoring hemp drugs (cannabis, marijuana) for medicinal use.

After a century of medicinal use, in 1937 hemp drugs were wrongfully removed from prescription availability and remain hostage to government "reefer madness" fiction.

Hemp drugs are effective and nontoxic for treating anxiety, pain, epilepsy, muscle spasm, anorexia, AIDS wasting syndrome, depression, and glaucoma.

A recent Harvard survey of physicians found willingness to prescribe cannabis, if available. The DEA administrative law judge Francis Young ruled that cannabis should be prescribed.

The initiative to RESTORE HEMP MEDICAL PREPARATIONS TO LIST OF AVAILABLE MEDICINES IN CALIFORNIA would help let physicians once again prescribe cannabis.

Tod Mikuriya, M.D., Psychiatrist,
Former Director of Marijuana Research
National Institute of Mental Health

Don’t let narrow-minded politics interfere with good medicine. As women who have gone through chemotherapy and are surviving cancer, we ask that you vote yes on this important measure.

Jo Daly, San Francisco Police Commissioner (Retired)
Marguerite (Maggi) Rubenstein, RN, MSCC, PhD

NORML has heard from countless patients who find marijuana uniquely beneficial for nausea, AIDS wasting syndrome, spasticity, glaucoma, chronic pain, migraines, depression, epilepsy and other intractable complaints.

In 1988, Drug Enforcement Administration Judge Francis Young ruled that marijuana has clearly established medical value and should be available as a prescription drug. Nevertheless, the government won’t allow marijuana to be prescribed for medical purposes.

Please vote yes on proposition P and signal our government that it is cruel to deprive patients of medical treatment.

Dale Gieringer, California National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws
Dennis Peron, Community Activist

Prior to the outlawing of marijuana in the 1930’s, it was prescribed in this country for numerous ailments. Marijuana has recently been found especially useful in the treatment of glaucoma, cancer and AIDS.

Until 1989 Marijuana was available by prescription in California in limited cases. Since 1989 it has been unavailable under any circumstances, even to a doctor.

Our present policies of classifying marijuana as synonymous with heroin and more serious than cocaine, are not only factually incorrect but unfair. These policies deprive many seriously ill persons of the relief this relatively mild herb can bring to their suffering.

This is a humanitarian issue.

Terence Hallinan
Member Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

Marijuana has been used legally in the United States to control nausea and vomiting, and is known as a potent appetite stimulant. Physicians can prescribe morphine to control pain. They should also be allowed to prescribe marijuana to alleviate the side effects of cancer therapy, AIDS, and eye treatments.

Ivan J. Silverberg, M.D.
Ernest M. Rosenbaum, M.D.

Patients have the right to receive treatment that has been shown to be beneficial. Marijuana has been shown to be safe and effective, particularly for nausea, in people being treated for cancer, AIDS, and other serious illnesses. We support Proposition P.

David Siegel, MD, MPH
Norman Hearst, MD, MPH
Thomas J. Coates, PhD
Stephen B. Hulley, MD
Leon H. McKusick, PhD
Susan M. Kegeles, PhD
Susan M. Rubin, MPH
Mark T. Gould
Joey Taylor
Robert H. Hilliard, MA
Eve Golden, MS
Robert M. Thomas
Lee Middleton
William Wolf
Susan Folkman, PhD
Michelle Berlin, MD
William J. Woods, PhD
Jocelyn Lighthill
David R. Gibson, PhD
Larry Osborn
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies
University of California at San Francisco

People suffering from cancer or HIV should be spared pain. Our county health director informs me this policy will help alleviate suffering from chemotherapy and other difficult treatments and serious illnesses. The Republican politicians in Washington are acting to remove this treatment even when prescribed by a physician for their patients who are in desperate pain. Vote “yes” on Proposition P.

Mayor Art Agnos.

Pot is good for the heart.
The NAS reports: "Indices of cardiac performance usually improve".
The reason: pot relaxes and dilates blood vessels, opening them to more blood flow with less friction. This "substantial decrease in peripheral vascular resistance" means the heart can pump more, without increased effort.

"Cardiac output... has been found to increase by... as much as 30%." Pot is "apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart".

These quotes are from MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

Grassroots

Many epileptics say marijuana reduces their seizures.
Similar benefits are often reported by people with multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and various spastic disorders.
Almost all have to break the law to get their medicine.
The National Academy of Sciences concluded:
"There is substantial evidence... that cannabinoïds are effective in blocking... seizures, particularly cannabidiol (CBD)."
In the best-controlled human study, eight epileptics received CBD. Seven showed significant reduction in seizures; no signs of toxicity.
Yet if you supply the pot that helps a disabled friend become more able, you can go to prison.
Why?

Grassroots

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The Bush administration is trying to make patients accept "Mariol" — synthetic THC capsules — instead of real mari-juana. Synthetics may be more profitable, but the natural herb is healthier.

"Mariol" is the most concentrated form of THC in history, therefore less safe.

"Mariol" contains only THC and no CBD, so it's almost useless for many purposes including seizure-prevention.

Asthma: smoking works better than capsules since it goes directly into the lungs.

— Smoking takes effect in minutes; capsules can take an hour or more.
— Many patients can't swallow a capsule without vomiting.
— With smoking, you can tell when you've had enough; with capsules you have to guess.

The FDA approved imitation marijuana only because real mar-ijuana was already known to be effective.

But the natural herb is more effective.
And safer.
So why can't doctors prescribe it?

Grassroots

[Paragraph about the National Academy of Sciences conclusion]

The National Academy of Sciences concluded that pot relieves asthma attacks.

THC capsules work, but smoking pot was more effective, and works faster, since it goes directly to the lungs.

There are also special marijuana pipes which heat and vaporize the pot without burning it; you inhale fumes but no smoke.

Such pipes are especially recommended for asthma.
Yet they're illegal.
Smokeless pipes can produce bronchodilation to relieve asthma — without irritation.
Why are they illegal?

Grassroots

"ACTIVE AGAINST NAUSEA"

Some other drugs can suppress nausea, but pot actually in-creases appetite. (But not obesity.)

That's vital for nausea from chemotherapy or wasting syndrome due to AIDS or cancer. The NAS reports:

"... there is a need for new and more reliable anti-emetic agents.

"...There seems little doubt that THC and other cannabinoids are active against the severe nausea and vomiting produced by cancer chemotherapeutic agents.

"... Cannabis leaf, smoked or eaten, is also anti-emetic..."

Grassroots

GLAUCOMA BLINDNESS

The NAS report considered glaucoma, for which Robert Randall has been smoking ten joints/day since the 1970s — supplied by the government.

"GLAUCOMA...leading cause of blindness in the United States...characterized by an increase in intraocular pressure...300,000 new cases...each year...

"Cannabis..., THC...and some other cannabinoid deriv-atives lower intraocular pressure..."

But, despite clear benefits, the FDA won't accept any more applications for government-grown pot. Even for those going blind.
Why?

Grassroots

[Paragraph about BAR/UPI report]

The BAR/UPI (5/2/91) reports:

"DOCTORS AT ODDS WITH DEA OVER USEFULNESS OF MARIJUANA"

"Nearly half of cancer specialists surveyed said they had re-commended at least one of their patients break the law and use marijuana to counter nausea from chemotherapy", according to a Harvard survey reported in Annals of Internal Medicine 4/30/91/

But the Bush administration and DEA refuse to acknowledge reality. They've granted a few dozen patients' requests for pot. But the vast majority have to break the law to get their medicine.
Until 1970, MDs could prescribe marijuana.
(Until the 1930s, you didn't even need a prescription.)
Bring back medical freedom!

Grassroots

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The National Academy of Sciences 1982 book, MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, makes clear that pot is less harmful than most other drugs (including alcohol and nicotine).

They concluded that pot has "very low lethal toxicity" and "no instance of human lung carcinoma attributable solely to marijuana smoking has yet been reported."

They found pot is "apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart and circulation" and "produced no evidence of brain atrophy" and "neither marijuana nor THC causes chromosome breaks."

Very few drugs could pass such exacting scrutiny! Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

I: The 12-9-87 Chronicle reports:

"3 S.F. HOSPITALS OK MARIJUANA, DOCTOR SAYS"

"At least three San Francisco hospitals routinely permit cancer patients to smoke marijuana because it relieves the violent nausea associated with chemotherapy, a doctor who practices in the city said yesterday."

"To be honest, I do not even think of marijuana as being illegal," said Dr. Ivan Silverberg, M.D., a doctor of oncology at UCSF."

"Dr. Ernest Rosenbaum, associate chief of medicine at Mt. Zion, said, 'We are not against it, because marijuana makes most cancer patients feel more comfortable when they come in for chemotherapy. So we tactfully encourage it.'"

Take politics out of the doctors office —

Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

A National Academy of Sciences committee found pot valuable for its "effect on appetite, nausea and vomiting, epilepsy, muscle spasticity, anxiety, depression, pain, and on glaucoma, asthma, and the symptoms of withdrawal from alcohol and narcotics."

"What is perhaps more encouraging than the therapeutic effects observed thus far is that cannabis seems to exert its beneficial effects through mechanisms that differ from those of other available drugs."

"This raises the possibility that some patients who would not be helped by conventional therapies could be treated effectively with cannabis."

Even when "conventional therapies" work, they're usually much more toxic than pot. If marijuana is apparently the safest and most effective medicine for some patients, their physicians should have the legal right to prescribe it. Vote Yes.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition P

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE OF CALIFORNIA.

I. The people of the City and County of San Francisco recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines in California. Licensed physicians shall not be penalized for or restricted from prescribing hemp preparations for medical purposes to any patient.

(1) Definition:
The term "hemp medical preparations" means all products made from hemp, cannabis, or marijuana, in all forms, that are designed, intended, or used for human consumption, for the treatment of any disease, the relief of pain, or for any healing purpose, including the relief of asthma, glaucoma, arthritis, anorexia, migraine, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, nausea, stress, for use as an antibiotic, an anti-emetic, or as any healing agent, or as an adjunct to any medical procedure for the treatment of cancer, HIV infection, or any other medical procedure or herbal treatment.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday, November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. Election Day. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on Election Day.
Out of town on November 5, 1991? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333
Federal Budget Priorities

PROPOSITION Q

Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified health and social welfare services and programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the federal government decides how much of the federal budget to spend on various programs, including the military.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition Q is a declaration of policy that calls on the federal government to reduce military spending by 10% each year for the next 5 years. The measure calls for the savings to be used for better housing, education, health care, AIDS and cancer research, job training and employment opportunities, environmental protection, mass transit, drug abuse prevention and treatment, and deficit reduction.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this declaration of policy about federal spending.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “Q”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition Q:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How “Q” Got on the Ballot

On July 25, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Doris M. Ward, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto, Roberta Achtenberg, Terence Hallinan, Willie B. Kennedy, Carole Migden, Kevin F. Shelley and Jim Gonzalez. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Federal Budget Priorities

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q is your chance to send a powerful message to our nation’s leaders: “It’s time to bring our tax dollars home!”

During the past 12 years while military spending has doubled, federal support for San Francisco has decreased by 33%. That means less of our federal tax dollar is available to help our city with the urgent problems of homelessness, education, AIDS, mass transit, and other human and environmental needs.

Proposition Q says we want more of our tax dollars used to help solve the crisis in our schools and on our streets. It’s time to reverse the military spending frenzy of the 1980’s. It’s time to invest in our communities.

Military experts agree that we can cut military spending without weakening our defense. We don’t need to spend billions on Stealth Bombers, MX Missiles, Star Wars, and the testing of new nuclear bombs.

Excessive military spending hurts our economy by adding to our national deficit and keeping interest rates high. Military spending creates far fewer jobs than spending on construction, civilian industries, education and health care.

Proposition Q is part of a national referendum that the voters of Chicago have already passed by a 74% majority. It will appear on local ballots across the nation in 1992. Let’s make San Francisco the second major city to stand up for sanity in how our tax dollars are spent.

We cannot afford to remain silent while our precious resources are wasted on weapons we don’t need for our defense. The health of our cities is vital to our national security.

As your local elected representatives, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition Q.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtemberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Maher
Absent: Supervisors Hsieh and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

We strongly support additional Federal help for San Francisco to fight AIDS and homelessness and to improve our educational and mass transit systems.

Passage of Proposition Q would injure all four of these causes.

We would like to believe that the folks in Washington might grant some of the so-called “saved” funds from the proposed Proposition Q budget cuts — and our already lost San Francisco Presidio payroll money — for our City’s other needs:

- Unfortunately, San Francisco will never receive “dime one” of these alleged “savings”.
- The closing of Letterman Military Hospital didn’t help its AIDS patients.
- Let’s not talk about what the Letterman closing did to the homeless veterans suffering from post-traumatic war stress.
- Strong majorities in the national Democratic and Republican Parties — over 80% in the U.S. House of Representatives — support current military budgeting levels as vital to United States safety and World Peace.

No doubt, some Exxon Oil executives would have liked Proposition Q-type budget cutbacks in place against all those “difficult” Coast Guardsmen overseeing the 1989 Valdez, Alaska tanker-spill cleanup operations.

Proposition Q will indeed send “a powerful message to our nation’s leaders”:

- To halt needed funds for San Francisco’s AIDS patients and needy veterans . . .
- To put the Bay Area on the bottom of their flood control and water protection funding lists . . .
- To curtail on Presidio historical buildings preservation money . . .
- To lower Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers’ resources for San Francisco Bay protection.

Vote AGAINST Proposition Q!!!

Citizens for Responsible Spending
Alexa Smith
Terence Faulkner

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

Proposition Q urges a 10% per year military budget cutback.
A major problem with Proposition Q is that it doesn’t define which military programs should be cut:
The U.S. Army, its reserves, and the California National Guard proved to be indispensable in the emergency following the October 17, 1989 Earthquake.
The needs caused by natural disasters — often caused by earth, wind, and fire — cannot be regulated by such 10% statutory reductions.
Oil spills, ship collisions, and rampant drug smuggling are problems which will occupy the Coast Guard for many decades to come. Ship safety inspections and enforcement of maritime regulations are further Coast Guard duties that will not go away.
The hydra-headed nightmares created by toxic wastes will long pose grave burdens for the military. The cleanups of the 1991 Sacramento River’s 45 miles of pesticide pollution and the 1989 Valdez, Alaska oil tanker mess are cases in point.
Maintaining the promised quality of medical services to veterans and their families is a continuing ethical obligation of the United States government. We certainly don’t need to close down more facilities like Letterman Military Hospital!!!
Taking money away from the Army Corps of Engineers would be a quick way to sabotage flood prevention programs and the water quality of the San Francisco Bay and Delta.
Proposition Q’s budget cutbacks, if implemented, would impact directly — and adversely — on the Bay Region’s economy, public health, citizen safety, and environmental quality.
Unwise military cutbacks have already forced the planned closing down of the San Francisco Presidio as an Army base. Further military funds will still be needed to preserve the Presidio’s historical buildings for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

C i t i z e n s  f o r  R e s p o n s i b l e  S p e n d i n g
Alexa Smith
Terence Faulkner


Reduced military spending benefits us all. A U.S. Conference of Mayors study found that a 10% shift from military to urban programs would result in a U.S. personal disposable income rise of $2.2 billion annually and greatly improved state and local tax revenues. Non-military spending creates more jobs. If Proposition Q’s spending changes were implemented there would be a net annual increase of 477,000 jobs nationwide. Military programs also pollute. The Defense Department has created 14,401 toxic waste sites. The federal toxic cleanup budget is dwarfed by the Pentagon budget.
The opponents of Proposition Q must be pulling our leg. They must know that the services they mention, such as the Coast Guard and disaster relief, can be fully funded by a fraction of the bloated military budget we have today. Congress can easily make the cuts that Proposition Q calls for through elimination of unnecessary and wasteful military programs. Simply cutting "Black Budget" programs, such as post-nuclear war planning, would save the first year cuts. The Stealth Program alone will cost U.S. taxpayers $15 billion dollars if the Pentagon gets all the planes it has asked for.
It is only by shifting our spending priorities from military waste to education, health, employment training, transit, environmental cleanup and peaceful technology that we will improve the quality of life in our nation’s cities.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisors Britt and Hsieh.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

For the future of our city and our nation, join with us in voting yes on Proposition Q.

Assemblyman John Burton
Sheriff Michael Hennessy
Alex Forman, SANE/FREEZE
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
National Lawyers Guild Bay Area Chapter
I.L.W.U. Local 6
Buck Bagot, Member Bernal Hills Democratic Club*
Women’s Int’l League for Peace and Freedom
Neighbor to Neighbor
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Green Party of San Francisco
S.F. Gray Panthers
Cesar Ascaruz
San Francisco Tomorrow
Greater Mission Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth*
Maryann O’Sullivan, Exec. Dir. Health Access*
John Moran, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*
Physicians for Social Responsibility
American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Region
Religious Soc of Friends, Soc Concerns Committee
Bishop Melvin Talbert, United Methodist Church*
San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
Latino Issues Forum
United Educators of San Francisco
Roberto Hernandez, Mission Econ & Cult Assoc*
Abalone Alliance
San Francisco Urban League
Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
George Wexler, Justice & Peace Commission, Catholic Archdiocese*
Veterans Peace Action
Dr. Amos Brown, Minister 3rd Baptist Church
Eva & Gene Royale - Chicano Latino Caucus*
Lulani S. McGriff, Pres. NAACP Branch*
David Chaifield, Reg. Dir. Greenpeace Action*
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Marie C. Malliet, Pres. C.W.A., Local 9410*
Charlene Tschirtzart, St. Anthony’s Foundation*
David Hartsough

*For Identification Purposes Only

Bush spent $1 billion a day to kill hundreds of thousands of Iraqis in a war that benefited only big banks and oil monopolies. Bush’s invasion of Panama was another case of taxpayers financing a war of aggression against a Third World country. Bush’s “New World Order” is really the same old imperialism. We need money for jobs and human needs, not war! U.S. hands off Cuba and Korea!

Gloria Estela La Riva,
Candidate for Mayor

Reagan presided over the greatest military build-up outside of war. The transfer of wealth from taxpayer to defense industries continues. Our enemy isn’t some boogie man in the Middle East; our enemies are poverty, ignorance, and disease at home. Let Congress know you want America to be number one in quality of life, not arms sales. Vote “yes” on Q.

Green Party of California, San Francisco Local
Kim Gilgenberg, Coordinating Committee

The Cold War is over but the Pentagon keeps spending our money at record levels. This year the taxpayers of San Francisco sent $1.4 billion to the Pentagon — almost 50% more than in 1980. Yet federal support to our city for transit is down 54%, housing is down 61% and job training is down 86%. Homelessness, underfunded schools, the AIDS epidemic and inadequate medical care are not simply local problems. They should also be national priorities. Proposition Q is our chance to bring our tax dollars home. We need more money for schools and housing — not the MX Missile and new Stealth bombers. Proposition Q is part of a national referendum on the future of our nation and our city. Join the elected leaders of San Francisco who support Proposition Q. Vote yes on Proposition Q. Our future depends on it.

Alex Forman
SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security.

In 1981, the federal government spent $36 billion on housing. This year they will spend $7 billion. That’s why people don’t have homes, and a record number are homeless in every major American city. Vote “yes” on Proposition Q.

Mayor Art Agnos

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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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q notifies the United States Congress that the City and County of San Francisco has developed, in addition to a notorious foreign policy, a domestic agenda. In fact, the City now wants to control the federal budget!

Vote “NO” on Proposition Q

Why can’t the members of the Board of Supervisors focus their attention on the needs of residents of the City and County of San Francisco? Why can’t the Board of Supervisors leave the federal budget to the United States Congress?

The Board and the Mayor can’t resolve San Francisco’s own budgetary problems but that doesn’t stop them from meddling with the federal budget! Sure, we want more money for housing, education, health care, job training and all the other necessities of our residents but let’s focus our energies and talents on what can be realistically accomplished in San Francisco. Let’s stop making our City look foolish!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION Q

“It is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that the federal government should reduce the military budget by ten percent (10%) each year for the next five (5) years, and use the savings to provide better housing, education, health care, AIDS and cancer research, job training and employment opportunities, environmental protection, mass transit, drug abuse prevention and treatment, and deficit reduction.”

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!

SAN FRANCISCO CURBSIDE RECYCLING

NO DEJE QUE EL VIENTO SE LLEVE SUS PAPELES RECICLABLES!

Ponga sus papeles reciclables en bolsas de papel o amárrellos con cuerda.
Ayúdenos a mantener limpia nuestras calles mientras recicle!

SAN FRANCISCO CURBSIDE RECYCLING
OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

There continues to be considerable confusion about the rules and procedures governing absentee ballots. The results are that some voters do not vote and others send in ballots that are not counted because the proper procedures were not followed. Voters who wish to vote by absentee ballot should familiarize themselves with the following information:

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT
Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night time telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT
To be counted your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, you may have your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the absentee ballot return envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING
Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, or because of a physical handicap are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot be delivered to you by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. These ballots may not be mailed.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

Because of the large volume of telephone calls we receive prior to the election, we have revised our telephone system to improve our responses to your telephone calls.

When you call the Office of the Registrar of Voters at 554-4375, you will hear a recording offering you the following choices:

TOUCH-TONE PHONES Press 1
SPANISH-SPEAKERS Press 2
CHINESE-SPEAKERS Press 3
ROTARY PHONES Hold

For people with touch-tone phones, after you have Pressed 1, you will have the following options:

Voter Registration Information and Forms Press 1
Absentee Voting Information and Forms Press 2
Working at the Polls Information Press 3
Candidates and Ballot Measures press 4
Information about Registered Voters Press 5
REPEAT — (Listen to choices again) Press 9
Other Topics Hold

Please write if you have suggestions for improving our telephone system.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Voter’s Quick Reference Card.
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17th Assembly District

Voter, the location of your polling place is shown on the label below. Please DO NOT remove the label from the Absentee Ballot Application.

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - November 5, 1991 Municipal Election

SIGN this application and return it to the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address
City State Zip Code

Check Here if Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote. My new address is printed below. (Do NOT use a P.O. Box or mail drop.)

Number and Street Name
Apt. No.

City
Zip Code

Check Below All That Apply, Then Sign Your Name:
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for Nov. 5, 1991; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot if there is a Run-Off Election on Dec. 10, 1991.

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Info Pamphlet in: Spanish ☐ Chinese ☐

Your SIGNATURE - Do Not Print
Date Signed
Day Time Phone
Evening Phone
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET &
SAMPLE BALLOT

November 5, 1991
Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work on Election Day - November 5, 1991 as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic activity.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, November 5, 1991.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

---------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ----------------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Init'I.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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**BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE**

Nicholas deLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock, League of Women Voters
Richard Miller, San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell, National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio, Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means.") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

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

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

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y 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 "Vomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

B 第一步
将两张选票向自動機將整張選票插入。

C 第二步
请确保将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，合於二红点之上。

D 第三步
请把带针之選舉針，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。
IMPORTANT NOTICE — “OUT WITH THE GRAY”

For many years, a gray envelope has been provided for two purposes: (1) to cover your ballot, thus keeping it secret, and (2) to give you a place to vote for write-in candidates, by writing their names in the space provided on the envelope.

Starting with this election, the gray secrecy envelope has been replaced by a long card which is attached to your ballot and folds over to cover your entire ballot, thus maintaining the secrecy of your vote. Now you will use the long card to vote for your write-in candidates. Just write in their names in the space provided on the attached card.

Thank you for cooperating with this change to improve the election process.

NEW VOTING BOOTHs!

Shorter lines at your polling places! We now have 6400 voting booths — 1600 more than we had before. This means that there will be more booths in polling places, reducing the waiting time whenever there are a number of people who arrive at the same time to vote.

All parts of the voting booths are made from recycled materials, and can be recycled again. These booths are much less expensive than the booths we previously used — $60 instead of $350 for each one. In addition, they have proven to be sturdy and long lasting by many other cities and counties. Because they are easier to transport and assemble, as well as being easier to maintain, our costs for each election are reduced.

To taxpayers, these booths represent a one-time savings of over $1.5 million and an additional $15,000 – $25,000 each election.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs
___ Lost use of both hands
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair)
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed on October 7. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by October 17, please call 554-4375.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots which are mailed to voters, or given to voters who request them in person at the Registrar's Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots are mailed back to the Registrar or deposited at the Registrar's Office in City Hall.

ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE (PROPOSITION M) — The Assessor determines how much money a piece of property would probably sell for on the open market. This figure is called the assessed property value. It is used to decide the amount people pay in property tax.

BINDING ARBITRATION (PROPOSITION B) — This happens when two disputing parties agree to have their conflict settled by a neutral third party. The two sides are then legally required to accept that settlement.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

CONDOMINIUM (PROPOSITION N) — A Condominium is an individually owned unit in a multi-unit building, such as an apartment.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS O, P, Q) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITIONS H, J, K, L, M, O, P) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

MEET AND CONFER (PROPOSITIONS C, D) — Before making changes in the terms of employment of City employees, the City must discuss these changes with the affected employee organizations.

MISDEMEANOR (PROPOSITION M) — This is a minor crime or offense that is punishable by a fine and/or a jail sentence of six months or less.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITIONS K, L, M, N) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

PROPOSITION — An issue which voters can vote to decide.

REFERENDUM (PROPOSITIONS L, M) — A law passed by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor does not go into effect for thirty days. If enough voters sign a petition during that thirty days, they can require that the law be placed on the ballot for the voters to approve. If the majority of voters vote "no" on that measure, then it will not become law.

REPEAL (PROPOSITION K) — This means you want to abolish an existing law.

ZONING (PROPOSITION L) — The City is divided into sections for different purposes, such as housing, business, playgrounds, etc., called zoning. Property in an area can only be used for the purpose for which it is zoned.

PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the November 5, 1991 Municipal Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote absentee) ................................. 7-13
2. the location of your polling place ................................................. (see label on the back cover)
3. applications for an absentee ballot and permanent absentee voter status ............................................. back cover
4. a rights of voters summary .............................................................. 14
5. information for disabled voters ...................................................... 15
6. statements from the candidates who are running for office ...................... 16-22
7. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text .............................................. 24-157
8. definitions of words you need to know ........................................... 6
9. a Voter Quick Reference Card to mark your choices and use when you vote ......................................................... inside back cover
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAYOR (ALCALDE) 市長</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM HSIEH</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK M. JORDAN</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONI JACOBS</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELA ALIOTO</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAR ASCARRUNZ</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER PLANTEEN</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHNERT C. QUEEN</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT ATTORNEY (FISCAL) 地方檢察官</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHERIFF (SHERIFF) 縣警長</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL HENNESSEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1919年十一月五日舊金山市選舉
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City's ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 80</td>
<td>NO 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 84</td>
<td>NO 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 89</td>
<td>NO 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 93</td>
<td>NO 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 98</td>
<td>NO 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 102</td>
<td>NO 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES MUNICIPALES, 5 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1991
MEDIDAS PRESENTADAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y EL CONDADO

A
¿Deberá ofrecer la Ciudad incentivos de jubilación temprana durante febrero y marzo de 1992 a fin de reducir la cantidad de empleados, y deberán existir restricciones en las facultades que tiene la Ciudad de reemplazar a algunas de las personas con jubilación temprana hasta el 1 de julio de 1993?

B
¿Podrá la Ciudad, en lugar de establecer los sueldos cada año mediante una fórmula, negociar sueldos y beneficios con ciertas organizaciones de empleados de la Ciudad, resolviéndose los desacuerdos por medio de un arbitraje que pudiera ser revocado mediante un voto de 2/3 del Consejo de Supervisores?

C
¿Deberán eliminarse de la Carta Constitucional ciertos reglamentos de contratación para el Servicio Civil, transfiriéndose los mismos a la Comisión de Servicio Civil?

D
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional a fin de ofrecer los mismos derechos de contratación para todos los postulantes con el mismo puntaje en una lista de servicio civil, y se otorgará a la Comisión de Servicio Civil la autorización de adoptar reglamentos que aumenten el número de postulantes que podrían ser considerados para contratación?

E
¿Los departamentos de la Ciudad tendrán el derecho de despedir a sus empleados, sujeto a apelación ante un funcionario externo, y tendrá la Ciudad el derecho de aceptar los procedimientos alternativos para el despido de empleados, incluyendo el arbitraje final y valedero?

F
¿Podrá el Consejo de Supervisores, cuando así se lo solicite el Alcalde, pagar a los empleados de la Ciudad la diferencia entre su sueldo municipal y su sueldo militar durante 180 días como máximo, mientras estén en servicio activo bajo circunstancias extraordinarias, siempre y cuando se cumplan ciertas condiciones?
### G
Shall Housing Authority police officers be allowed to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements?

**Yes**: 106

**No**: 107

### H
Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor’s Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor’s compensation?

**Yes**: 110

**No**: 111

### I
Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?

**Yes**: 115

**No**: 116

### J
Shall the City be required to create a Children’s Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children’s Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?

**Yes**: 119

**No**: 120

### K
Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a “domestic partnership”?

**Yes**: 124

**No**: 125

### L
Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?

**Yes**: 128

**No**: 129
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Podrán los oficiales de la policía de Autoridad de Vivienda convertirse en oficiales de policía de San Francisco si cumplen con los requisitos estatales y de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>应否允许符合州和市要求的房屋管理局的警员成为金山市警员?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá prohibirse a la Ciudad contratar en nombre del Alcalde a cualquier empleado, incluyendo al asistente del Alcalde, cuyas funciones incluyan la supervisión de cualquier departamento de la Ciudad, y deberá limitarse el sueldo de los empleados de la Oficina del Alcalde hasta un 70% del sueldo del Alcalde?</td>
<td>应否禁止市政府为市长雇用任何职员,包括副市长,其职责包括监督市政府各部门;市长办公室职员的薪酬应否限制在市长薪酬的70%?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional a fin de permitir que los residentes de San Francisco menores de 18 años de edad puedan ser nombrados a un consejo, comisión u organismo asesor, en caso de que la ley que cree dicho organismo permita tales nombramientos?</td>
<td>应否修正市宪章以便允许十八岁以下的金山市民可获任命进入依法设立的局、委委员会或咨询机关内任职?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá requerirse que la Ciudad establezca un Fondo para la Infancia que será usado sólo para ciertos servicios adicionales para la infancia, reservando cierta cantidad de los ingresos por impuestos a la propiedad en dicho Fondo durante diez años, y deberá requerirse que la Ciudad prepare un Plan Anual de Servicios para la Infancia que establezca los objetivos de dicho Fondo?</td>
<td>应否规定市政府设立儿童基金,专用于增加某些儿童服务,连续十年每年拨出一定数额的营业税款作此基金,应否规定市政府制定年度儿童服务计划,订立基金目标?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá revocar la Ciudad la ordenanza que permite que dos adultos no casados y sin vínculo familiar que viven juntos y están de acuerdo en ser responsables conjuntamente de sus gastos básicos de vida establezcan su relación formalmente como &quot;sociedad doméstica&quot;?</td>
<td>现有法令允许两个未婚、无关系的成年人同居并同意共同分担他们基本生活费,正式建立他们的“家庭伴侣”关系,市政府应否废除这一法令?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se adoptará la ordenanza que cambia la zona del Circuito Phelan ubicado en las calles Ocean y Phelan en frente al City College de &quot;P&quot; (Distrito para Uso Público) a “NC-2” (Distrito Comercial de Vecindario de Pequeña Escala)?</td>
<td>应否通过法令把位于市立大学对面的海洋道和非建街的非建区重新分区分,从“P”(公用区)改作“NC-2”(小规模街坊商业区)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reverso</td>
<td></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>M</td>
<td>Shall the City’s rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?</td>
<td>YES 132</td>
<td>NO 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?</td>
<td>YES 136</td>
<td>NO 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City’s unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression?</td>
<td>YES 143</td>
<td>NO 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?</td>
<td>YES 147</td>
<td>NO 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified health and social welfare services and programs?</td>
<td>YES 151</td>
<td>NO 152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
<th>PREGUNTA</th>
<th>TEXTO CHINO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará el control de alquileres de la Ciudad a fin de limitar la cantidad que un dueño pueda cobrarle a un inquilino nuevo hasta un máximo del 10% al 14% mayor que el alquiler pagado por el inquilino anterior, siempre y cuando el dueño pudiera recibir un aumento adicional en caso de cumplirse ciertas condiciones?</td>
<td>應否修正市政府的房租管制法令，限制房东向新住客所收房租不得超过旧住客所付房租的10%至14%，但如果符合一定条件，房东可以加租?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la ley de la Ciudad que limita el tipo de edificios y la cantidad de unidades (200 anualmente) que puedan convertirse a condominios a fin de crear un procedimiento paralelo que hace que todos los edificios de alquiler residencial puedan convertirse a condominios sin limite anual y sin tener en cuenta las demás restricciones de la ley actual, siempre y cuando por lo menos el 51% de los inquilinos aprueben esta conversión, el dueño del edificio proporcione el 90% del financiamiento, el inquilino tenga la primera opción de comprar la unidad al 75% de su valor de mercado y se cumplan con otras condiciones?</td>
<td>應否修正市法例，使原限制某類樓宇和單位數目（每年200單位）合格改建為共渡公寓可訂立並行程序法使所有住宅出租樓房均合格改建為共渡公寓而免於年度限制，並不受現有法律的某些限制，如果獲得至少51%住客的書面同意，房東能自籌90%資金，住客有優先權以市值75%的價格購買單位，所有不願購買的住客有權繼續長期租住，除非是合法遷遷，以及符合其他一些條件?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco confirmar el apoyo incondicional de la Ciudad ante el derecho de libertad de expresión delineado en la Primera Enmienda?</td>
<td>肯定本市無條件支持第一修正案的言論自由權應否成為舊金山人民的一項政策?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco recomendar que el Estado de California y la Asociación Médica de California vuelvan a permitir las medicinas de cáñamo en su lista de medicamentos disponibles?</td>
<td>建議加州政府和加州醫學會恢復大麻藥劑為可使用的藥物應否成為舊金山人民的一項政策?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco que el gobierno federal reduzca el presupuesto militar en un 10% anual durante los siguientes 5 años, utilizando los ahorros a fin de mejorar ciertos servicios y programas específicos de salud y bienestar social?</td>
<td>要求聯邦政府在未來五年每年削減軍費10% 並把省下來的錢更好地提供特定的衛生保健和社會福利服務計劃應否成為舊金山人民的一項政策?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL DE LA BALOTA**
選舉完畢
一九九一年十一月五日舊金山市選舉 提交選民投票公決的提案 市縣提案
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in
San Francisco before October 8, 1991

Q — I moved on or before October 7; can I vote in this elec-
tion?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must
re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after October 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between October 8 and Novem-
ber 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — You can vote for:
Mayor, District Attorney and Sheriff.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label
on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, November 5, 1991. Your polling
place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you
have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If
you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-
4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

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.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into
the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help
you. You may wish to take the Voter’s Quick Reference Card
which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t
know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you.
Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.
A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned
in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of
Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name
of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to
vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the
person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in
votes.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place
on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before November 5 if you:
• Fill out and mail in the application for an absentee ballot
printed on the back cover of this book. You will be sent
an absentee ballot within three days after we receive your
request. Your request must be received by the Registrar of
Voters no later than October 29, 1991; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall –
Room 158 from October 7 through November 5. The
office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday
through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November
2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day,
November 5.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee
ballot some other way?
A — You may mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters
asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include: your
home address, the address to which you want the ballot
mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request
must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard
Sevilla and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian
Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organi-
zations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other
citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the
officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration,
elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters;
investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local
election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relat-
ning to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen partic-
ipation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters
referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from October 7 through November 5. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on November 2 and 3, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 5. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed on page 5 of this pamphlet may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 1528 Fillmore Street produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

MAYOR
The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City and County of San Francisco. The term of office for the Mayor is four years. The Mayor is paid $129,090 a year.

SHERIFF
The Sheriff runs the county jails and provides bailiffs (security) for the courts. The term of office for the Sheriff is four years. The Sheriff is paid $93,886 a year.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
The District Attorney prosecutes criminal court cases for the City and County of San Francisco. The term of office for District Attorney is four years. The District Attorney is paid $116,584 a year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Mayor

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 1930 Hyde Street
My occupation is Party of Life, Leader
My age is 34.
My qualifications for office are: I have made no deals or commitments to any "Special Interest" nor will I. As Mayor I will proudly declare for all to hear that my employer is all the people of San Francisco — Democrats, Republicans, and Independents — of every neighborhood, of every economic group and every community. If hard work, dedication, and devotion to the office of Mayor will make San Francisco a better city, I will give it everything I have. It is from the people that the proud spirit of "I Will" springs. It is with the people that this spirit resides, spurring all of us to greater effort.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

TOM HSIEH

My address is 1151 Taylor Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: I want to make San Francisco world-class again. But it'll take vision and guts to restore our economic health. Like the historic retirement program I created to trim the City's payroll — without layoffs or cutting services — saving $25 - 35 million a year.
My blueprint for San Francisco is based on 5 common-sense themes . . .
A Safe City . . . with adequate law enforcement.
A Clean City . . . to live and work in.
A Competitive City . . . with a balanced budget and healthy economy.
A Liveable City . . . with services for families and the elderly.
A Fair City . . . with respect and equality for everyone.

Tom Hsieh

The sponsors for Tom Hsieh are:

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

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: I have the most extensive executive management experience of any mayoral candidate.
It must be management that serves all of San Francisco: environmentalists; all of our neighborhoods and movements; African Americans; Asians; gays and lesbians; Latinos and women.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I dramatically and progressively reformed the department and proved I can turn around a City.
I am the only candidate with a proven track record as Sheriff, Supervisor and Assessor.
Because of my record, I have received the endorsement of N.O.W.; the major gay and lesbian organizations; many Democratic clubs; and neighborhood leaders.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:
Carlota Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, School Board Member.
Michael S. Bernick, 3961 Sacramento St., BART Director. Libby
Denebelm, 200 St. Francis Blvd., SF School Board Member. Ruth
Brinker, 336 Moultrie St., Founder, Project Open Hand. Thomas C.
Fleming, 1727 Fillmore St., #314, Editor, Sun Reporter. Del Martin,
651 Duncan St, Author/Lecturer. Louis H. Lee, 1 Daniel Burnham
Ct., #105, Lawyer. Douglas L. Comstock, 610 22nd St., #253, Artist.
Espanola Jackson, 3231 Ingalls, Homemaker/Community Activist.
John Bards, 1501 Lincoln Way, Former San Francisco Supervisor.
Ksenia Tseen, 637 Steiner, Attorney. Alan D. Weaver, 1070 Haight
St., Environmentalist. Nadine Safadi, 127 Crespi Dr., Community
Activist. Richard Young, 16 Ort Ct., #2, Editor/President, Stone
wall Club. Daniel J. Addario, 950 Columbus Ave., #16, Former
Special Agent, Drug Enforcement Agency. Phyllis A. Lyon, 651
Duncan St., Author/Educator. Jesse D. Wall, 225 Edna, Physics
Professor. James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Super
visor. Barbara J. Thompson, 40 Gladius St., Coordinator - Employ
ment/Affirmative Action. Adrian M. Bermudez, Jr., 1350 Geneva
Ave., Environmental Health. Haldie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Senior
Investigator, District Attorney's Office. Joyce D. Aldana, 1299
Lombard, #41, Businesswoman. Jewel Green, 131 Middle Point Rd.,
Vice President, Hunters View Resident Management Council. Roger
Cardenas, 34 Liberty St., #2, Businessperson. Margaret A. Verges,
304 Pine St., Counselor/Neighborhood Activist. Troy H.
Dangerfield, 235 Westgate Dr., Retired Police Officer. Salvador
Garza, 795 Brunswick, Self-Employed. Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159
42nd Ave., Parliamentarian. Francis J. Clauss, 437 Pennsylvania
Ave., Author/Publisher. John E. Wahl, 65 Hermann St., #3, Lawyer.

DEHNERT C. QUEEN

My address is 956 Sacramento Street, Apt. 305
My occupation is CEO, Small Business Development Company
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco's past and present incumbents act to enhance only THEIR future — NOT the people who pay their wages.
I've proven Mission Bay, Waterfront, transit plans:
- Will increase cost-of-living $282/month/resident!
- Transit extensions will be obsolete upon completion (year 2000)!
- $7.3 BILLION BEING MISUSED AGAINST US!
My plans create:
- PRIVATELY-FUNDED Worldwide Business Gateway — housing, ballpark, commerce, SKILLED jobs. I raised needed $625 million!
- INTEGRATED transit — CalTrain/Metro constructed in THREE, not eleven years.
- SAVES TAXPAYERS $2.7 BILLION!
My Committee Against Mission Bay PREVAILED (1990)!
BUT, Agnos, Alioto, Hongisto, Hsieh have quietly formalized Agnos' plans ADMINISTRATIVELY!
Want More? ASK!
VOTE!

Dehnert C. Queen

The sponsors for Dehnert C. Queen are:
Wm. Scott Hepburn, 353 Rivera St., Student. Glenn H. Kobuchl,
2058 23rd Ave., Travel Agency. Kenneth Cresci, 1567 42nd Ave.,
Motorcycle Shop Owner. Karen Dehnert, 2384 29th Ave., Book
binder. Richard A. Rehl, 775 Post St., Manager. Mary K. Kovac,
1594 46th Ave., Retired. Judith Willwens, 1522 11th Ave., Sales
person. Esther E. Dehnert, 2384 29th Ave., Salesperson. Letty M.
McGowan, 1789 Oak St., Loft, Sales. Helnz J. Winslow, 3936
Noriega St., Printer. Donna M. Yurasak, 33 Child St., Insurance
Broker. Charles T. Enders, 2065 California St. #101, Opera
Singer/Chorus. Cornelia J. Monroe, Jr., 2065 California St. #101,
Broadcast Business Manager. Albert Haas, 8 Locksley Ave. 10B,
Retired. Joseph M. Blank, 2035 Castro St. #21, Management Con
sultant. Lex E. Fukumitsu, 1025 Powell St. #36, Food & Beverage
Director. Nina E. Rudolph, 956 Sacramento St #302, Retired. Hazel J.
Best, 956 Sacramento St. Apt. 403, Retired. Phyllis L. Ellis, 956
Sacramento St. #405, Retired. Melody L. Lacy, 1314A Kearny St.,
Copier Service Person. Joel Timothy, 600 Grand View Ave. #3,
Musician-Songwriter. Linda D. Ward, 1304 11th Ave., Cocktail
Server. Judy L. Wong, 18 Berkeley Way, Educator. Heather Lacy,
1314A Kearny St., Production Coordinator.

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

GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA

My address is 3207 Mission St. #9
My occupation is Union newspaper printer
My qualifications for office are: People's needs first, not profits. Housing, healthcare, AIDS funding, jobs, schools, transit, libraries, comprehensive senior services, youth programs, arts, environmental protection, earthquake safety, abuse programs, childcare, should be guaranteed rights. Fund programs by taxing large corporations' profits. Oppose racism, sexism, homophobia, AIDS discrimination, police brutality. Strengthen affirmative action. Defend union rights. Affordable housing must be a right! Build housing, use Presidio, freeze rents, real vacancy control. Defend reproductive rights. Embargo South Africa. Support Palestinian national rights. Oppose military spending, war. Ultimately, we need socialism, based on people's needs, not profits.

Gloria Estela La Riva

The sponsors for Gloria Estela La Riva are:
Danny Anderson, 171 Fell St., #41, Outreach Worker for Homeless.

PETER PLANTEEN

My address is 1060 Powell St. #32
My occupation is Men's Clothing Store Owner
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: I am a small but successful businessman who would run the City of San Francisco, exactly the way I've ran my business. I would bring imagination and a hands on policy on every issue. My experience dealing with people all of my adult life will help me find solutions out of problems and then solve these problems. I have never held political office before, but I do not consider that a liability. In fact, I consider that an asset, because I will bring my businessman's mentality to City Hall and offer a fresh and logical approach to city government.

Peter Planteen

The sponsors for Peter Planteen are:
Candidates for Mayor

CESAR ASCARRUNZ

My address is 3140 Mission Street
My occupation is businessman
My qualifications for office are: I have been a successful businessman in San Francisco for the past 30 years. I have proven business management skills with a strong academic background.

Over the past 10 years I have been active in benefits for integration teachers and education, gay, lesbian and woman rights, hispanic pride, the homeless and the environment.

I have been an advisor for business and cultural affairs as a member of multiple community organizations which have earned me the unofficial title of the Mayor of the Mission District.

Cesar Ascarrunz

The sponsors for Cesar Ascarrunz are:

ART AGNOS

My address is 106 Dorchester Street
My occupation is Mayor of San Francisco
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: The job of government is to be a friend to those who would be vulnerable without it: any of us can find ourselves powerless, any worthy concern can start out friendless.

As Mayor, I’ve championed our city’s earthquake recovery from full Red Cross relief to reassuring convention planners and building our emergency response. I’ve won new AIDS funding, increased child care, implemented Prop M, and am expanding mass transit.

We’re opening the waterfront by tearing down the Embarcadero Freeway, we’re opening opportunity by building affordable housing and vacancy control and we’ve opened government to all. I respectfully offer my candidacy.

Art Agnos

The sponsors for Art Agnos are:
Candidates for Mayor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a native San Franciscoan and mother of four, I cannot tolerate seeing San Francisco turned into a dull, harsh place.

Our City’s health is in jeopardy as City Hall closes human services, ignores dirty streets, lets MUNI deteriorate and forces businesses to flee.

As your Supervisor, I’ve worked to preserve effective programs that:
- care for the mentally ill
- provide shelter for abused women and children
- prevent AIDS through education and intervention
- provide mobility to seniors.

With new leadership in the Mayor’s office, a change of priorities, and some Alioto energy, we can restore health to the City we all love.

Angela Alioto

The sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

JONI JACOBS

My address is 774 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Socialist Action Pro-choice Activist
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: My program that says human needs are human rights:
- Funded abortion rights and child care.
- House the homeless.
- Free health care for all, including people with AIDS.
- Quality public education — no teacher layoffs or cutbacks!
- Union scale for workers on city contracts — no wage freezes!
- Union-scale job training for youth and unemployed workers.
- End police brutality against minorities and gays; Black community control of police.
- Tax the rich and corporations to fund human needs — no regressive taxes!
- No money for war or prison construction!

The bosses have two parties. Workers need a labor party to represent them.

Vote Socialist Action!

Joni Jacobs

The sponsors for Joni Jacobs are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
FRANK M. JORDAN

My address is 3350 Laguna Street, #101
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans have had sand kicked in their faces by the bully in the Mayor's office. Does Art Agnos work only for himself, or for you? I've worked FOR San Franciscans for 33 years — building over 1,000 SAFE neighborhood blockclubs and starting our Senior Escort Program. As Chief, I founded our Hate Crimes Unit and the school anti-drug program. I fought to integrate the SFPD, appointing the highest-ranking Black, Latino, Asian and Women officers and actively recruiting Lesbians and Gays.

As Mayor, I will ban Agnos' Deputy Mayors and audit every department eliminating waste. Make San Francisco work for you.

Frank M. Jordan

The sponsors for Frank M. Jordan are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., State Senator/Attorney,
Lawrence J. Mazziola, 3060 24th Ave., Labor Leader. Rhoda H.
Goldman, 3700 Washington St., Environmentalist. John A. Ertola,
219 32nd Ave., Retired Judge. Rose Resnick, 40 Anza Vista, Social
Service. Samuel Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Businessman. Stephen
Nakafo, 612 Hemlock St., Community Activist. Arlene C. Wong,
577 Missouri St., Disabled Rights Advocate. Richard N. Goldman,
3700 Washington St., Philanthropist. Gloria L. Fontanello, 1435
Bay St., President — Neighborhood Assoc./Activist. LeRue J.
Grim, 145 25th Ave., Criminal Defense Lawyer. Stanley M. Smith,
15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official. Vincent J. Rovetti, 433
Wayland Ave., Florist. Xavier O. Barrios, 171 San Benito Way,
Physician. Lorraine L. Rominger, 3636 Scott St., #202, TV Pro-
ducer. Jeremy P. Stone, 949 Filbert St., #6, Art Dealer. Rotea J.
Gilford, 54 Carmelita, Retired, Executive Director — Criminal Jus-
Stephen Cornell, 1510 Portola Dr., Small Business Owner. Julia
Campbell, 134 Parker Ave., Retired Secretary. Rebecca H.
Villareal, 610 Guerrero St., #4, Student. John J. Moylan, 2985 24th
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Place, Member, Board of Trustees — City
College of S.F. Kevin O. Starr, 445 Chestnut, University Professor.
Elleen O'Sullivan, 2491 21st Ave., Registered Nurse. Joseph A.
Wahed, 1940 Sacramento St., #1, Economist. Dolores Costuros, 188
Morningside Dr., Homemaker. Era M. Geller, 2938 Divisadero St.,
Homemaker. Keith I. Marton, 120 Belgrave Ave., Physician.

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for District Attorney

ARLO SMITH

My address is 66 San Fernando Way
My occupation is District Attorney of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: I'm very proud of what my office has accomplished since I've been San Francisco’s D.A. Among our many achievements:
- An award-winning Hate Crimes Unit that was California’s first;
- A Drug Strike Force targeting upper-level drug dealers that’s achieved a conviction rate of 95%;
- A Consumer/Environmental Protection Unit that’s one of the best and most effective in California;
- A Family Support Bureau collecting some $17 million annually for 15,000 dependent children in San Francisco;
- A Domestic Violence Unit that’s a nationwide model.
I ask for your vote to continue to serve San Francisco.

Arlo Smith

The sponsors for Arlo Smith are:

Candidate for Sheriff

MICHAEL HENNESSEY

My address is 261 Anderson Street
My occupation is Sheriff of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: As Sheriff, I have kept my promise to restore safety and security to the jails. I have significantly improved training for deputy sheriffs and have instituted nationally acclaimed county jail prisoner education and vocational programs.
I have also kept my promise to bring women and minorities into top management and to create a permanent program to assist senior and disabled citizens facing eviction.
My pledge to you is a Sheriff’s Department dedicated to equal justice and compassion for all San Franciscans.
Your strong support recognizes our past achievements and provides the foundation for continuing progress.
Thanks for your support.

Michael Hennessey

The sponsors for Michael Hennessey are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against the measures. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None have been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure and one argument against the measure are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge. These arguments are called the "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument."

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" only indicates that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency.

Rebuttal arguments are printed following the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments which will be published in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

Paid arguments are printed following the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order, but are arranged to make the most efficient use of each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. They are printed as submitted. No corrections are made to spelling and/or grammatical errors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Early Retirement

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City provide early retirement incentives during February and March 1992 to reduce its workforce and shall there be restrictions on the City's ability to replace certain early retirees until July 1, 1993?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees may retire at age 50 if they have worked for 20 years or at age 60 if they have worked for 10 years. Generally, an employee's pension increases with the number of years worked, the employee's age and salary. Once a retired employee leaves the payroll, the City may fill the position immediately.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A is a charter amendment to encourage employees (other than firefighters, police officers, and those in the state retirement system) to retire early. For retirement purposes, qualified employees would be treated as if they had worked three years longer and were three years older. This would allow some employees to retire who are not now eligible. Also, it would increase the retirement pay of employees who are already eligible to retire. Employees would have to retire on or after February 1, 1992 and before March 31, 1992 to qualify under this measure.

Proposition A would require that certain jobs left vacant by early retirement be eliminated. A committee made up of the Mayor, Controller and General Manager of Personnel would recommend which jobs to eliminate. Two persons chosen by the San Francisco Labor Council would serve as advisory members. First, the committee would decide which jobs could not be eliminated. Under Proposition A these include: City officers, jobs producing money for the City, jobs paid for by money the City receives from state or federal government, jobs vital to public health, safety and transit, and jobs required by law.

Second, the committee would recommend which of the remaining vacant positions to eliminate. The Mayor would have to eliminate 500 or 50% of those jobs, whichever is more. The jobs would be eliminated from the budget until July 1993 unless the Mayor recommends filling the jobs and 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors agree.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could result in a net savings of approximately $20.5 million in fiscal 1992-93 and similar savings could recur in subsequent years. This is due to a projected increase in the cost of the City's Retirement System of approximately $4.5 million in 1992-93, offset by an estimated $25 million in salary savings from positions vacated through early retirement.

Based on estimates from the Retirement System, approximately 1500 employees might accept the provisions of this measure and vacate their positions. The amendment sets a minimum of 500 or 50% of the vacated positions to be removed from the budget in 1992-93, but allows the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to add back positions by a two-thirds vote. If 500 positions are removed, salary and fringe benefit savings of approximately $25 million per year could result. The actual savings may vary depending on the number of early retirees, their respective salary levels and the number of positions and length of time they are held vacant.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 31, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, and Carole Migden.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Early Retirement

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Early Retirement charter amendment is a win-win proposition for San Francisco. The City will reward its long-time employees and at the same time save millions of dollars. This is a sensible way to pare down the City’s payroll.

Proposition A will save between $25 and $37 million a year for San Francisco. That’s money that we can direct towards critically needed programs and services for our neighborhoods, our children, the homeless and all San Francisco residents.

Reducing the City’s payroll through this Early Retirement program will help the City live within its means. Proposition A requires that a minimum of 500 positions be eliminated from the City budget.

A yes vote is a vote to offer a golden handshake to those who have provided long-term service to our city. Employees who are eligible to retire early will receive their full pension benefits. We will then be able to eliminate positions that are non-essential for the provision of city services. And we will not lay off any workers! Everyone in San Francisco will be a winner if you vote yes on Proposition A!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez and Migden.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

City government needs reforming. In 1985, I publicly warned officials about the fiscal chaos the City would experience unless decisive changes were made in management and finance practices. Those changes never came and San Francisco has been riddled with debt and mismanagement since.

Proposition A contributes to reform. It lets City workers with lengthy service take early retirement. Minimally, 500 voluntary vacancies will be created. These non-essential slots cannot be refilled by the mayor. There are no forced layoffs.

This measure saves San Francisco $25 million annually. Still pressing is the need to reorganize our 66 departments. My campaign has laid out a comprehensive plan to restructure City government.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

As the author of Proposition A, I urge you to support this measure. Your yes vote will help restore fiscal responsibility to City Hall. In recent years we have let the size and cost of government spiral out of control, but now we have a chance to reverse that trend.

This measure will eliminate 500 non-essential positions without layoffs and create a $25 to $37 million annual savings, all without reducing services! Savings can be used to improve local programs. San Francisco will become a competitive and liveable city again.

Raising fees and taxes is not the only way to create revenues. It is time to bring common sense to our fiscal policies. I urge you to vote for Proposition A so we can take the first step!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I advocate a “yes” vote. Measure A reduces city employment by offering long-term employees early retirement. The savings would be $20.5 million. Essential city services will be protected because no police or firefighter positions will be left vacant under Proposition A.

Mayor Art Agnos

Rarely can voters cut the cost and size of government and provide funding for necessary programs with one vote, but Proposition A provides that opportunity.

Proposition A provides an incentive for City employees to leave their employment thru an early retirement program, reducing jobs without the need to lay off workers. Savings can be used for needed services and programs or to reduce the cost of government.

Proposition A commits the City to reduce its payroll, abolishing at least 500 positions vacated by those who retire.

Business and Labor urge you to join them in voting Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

Stan Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council

Stephen Cornell, Past President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

Question — Is it possible to develop a major job reduction, cost saving program without causing lay-offs of City employees who have given loyal service to San Francisco citizens?

Proposition A provides a positive answer to the aforementioned question and serves as proof that Business, Labor and City Government can work together to develop an early retirement program that reduces jobs while at the same time preventing lay-offs. Proposition A also commits the City to reduce on-going pay roll costs by not replacing 500 workers who retire early at a cost savings of 20 million dollars.

The San Francisco Labor Council strongly urges a yes vote on Proposition A, which is truly a win-win situation for all San Franciscans.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition A

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 thereto, providing for early service retirement.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 8.517-2 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.517-2 EARLY SERVICE RETIREMENT

(a) The retirement board shall provide an incentive for members under sections 8.509 and 8.584 to retire early for service by increasing the member's age and credited service for both qualification and benefit computation purposes by three (3) years.

This early retirement incentive shall apply only to members who retire from service with an effective date of retirement on or after February 1, 1992 and prior to March 31, 1992. This benefit increase will not apply to a vesting retirement.

(b) No later than April 1, 1992, the retirement board shall assemble and transmit to the Mayor's office a list of all positions vacated as a result of early retirement incentive created by this section. Immediately thereafter, the Mayor shall convene a review committee consisting of the Mayor, Controller, and the General Manager, Personnel, or their designees and two labor representatives appointed by the San Francisco Labor Council who shall serve as advisory members of the committee. That committee shall review all positions identified in the aforementioned list for the purpose of determining which positions must be filled ("mandated positions") according to any one of the following criteria:

1. positions designated as officers by Section 1.103 of this charter;
2. positions determined to be vital to public safety or the delivery of health and transit services;
3. positions which the city is under a legal duty to fill pursuant to consent decree, memorandum of understanding in effect prior to August 1, 1991, contract, state or federal law, court decisions, or other legal requirements;
4. positions that produce revenues or reimbursements to the city or positions funded substantially through enterprise funds or funds provided to the city through grants, or state or federal reimbursements or bond proceeds.

Thereafter, the review committee shall calculate the number of non-mandated positions that were vacated. The committee shall review each non-mandated position and make a recommendation as to which positions should be abolished. In order to maximize the cost savings benefits of early retirement, the review committee shall give special attention to reviewing those positions with salaries in excess of $60,000.

The Mayor shall receive and review the recommendations of the review committee and thereafter is authorized and directed to abolish in the 1991-92 fiscal year budget at least 500 or 50% of the vacated, non-mandated positions on the list, whichever is greater. The Mayor shall effect that abolition by transmitting a communication to the controller and the Board of Supervisors identifying the positions that have been abolished. In addition, the City shall abolish the same positions in the fiscal year 1992-93 budget and salary ordinance. It is not the intent of this section that work performed by such abolished positions shall be contracted out.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned abolition of positions, upon the recommendation of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, by a two-thirds vote, may restore to the 1991-92 budget or place in the 1992-93 budget any of the aforementioned non-mandated positions.

(c) The early retirement benefits offered under this section shall not be interpreted to apply to the provisions of Charter Sections 8.509(f) and 8.584-6. The early retirement benefits under this section shall be limited by the maximum percentage limitations in Charter Sections 8.509(b) and 8.584-2.

The early retirement benefits under this section will be limited by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and no early retirement benefits under this section will be effective if they have an adverse effect on the tax qualified status of the retirement system under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Collective Bargaining

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City, instead of setting salaries each year by formula, be allowed to bargain collectively over wages and benefits with certain City employee organizations, with disagreements resolved by arbitration which can be overturned by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The wages of most City employees are set each year based only on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Benefits such as dental care and vacation can only be added or changed with voter approval. Other terms of employment, such as uniform allowances, are negotiated with employee organizations through collective bargaining.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B is a charter amendment that would allow employee organizations representing most City workers to negotiate wages, hours, benefits and other working conditions through collective bargaining. Employee organizations would have a choice of this extension of collective bargaining or having their terms of employment set as they are now. The decision by an employee organization to choose collective bargaining would be permanent.

If parties could not reach agreement through collective bargaining, each side would submit a final offer on disputed issues to an arbitration board. The arbitrators would choose either the City’s or employee organization’s entire offer without change. The arbitrators must consider the cost of living, wages and benefits paid elsewhere, the City’s financial situation and other factors. The arbitrators’ decision could be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, which could choose the other side’s final offer by a 2/3 vote.

For employees not represented by an employee organization, terms of employment would be set by the Mayor subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition B would not affect the civil service provisions on hiring and promotions. Generally, the way retirement benefits are set would not change.

As a result of previous negotiations of various issues including a wage freeze, if Proposition B passes a majority of City workers will get dental coverage.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.
Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

The proposed Charter amendment allows employee unions representing approximately 24,000 City, School District and Community College miscellaneous (non-teaching) employees the option to either negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, or to remain under existing formulae which set salaries by a survey of local employers and require voter approval to change benefits and working conditions. As a product of the application of this change, the cost of government could increase or decrease, depending on the outcome of future negotiations and arbitration awards.

Any change in the manner of setting salary and fringe benefit rates can have a substantial effect on the cost of City government since total salary and fringe benefit costs for the employees potentially affected by this charter amendment amount to slightly less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Also, in my opinion, costs for negotiation, grievance and arbitration services will increase in a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount.

Additionally, this amendment would allow provisions of current memoranda of understanding with some affected employee organizations to take effect. These memoranda provide:

- The City will allow certain employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992-93;
- A dental plan will be adopted effective April 1, 1992, estimated to cost $13 million per year;
- Unions agree not to contest in court the 1991-92 salary freeze which avoided approximately $82 million in salary and benefit costs;
- City will adopt 1992-93 salary rates using existing formulae.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B IS FiscALLY RESPONSIBLE REFORM SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS NOW.

Present economic realities call for reforming City employee salary setting standards, providing fiscal checks for the City and flexibility for City workers. This year, the City saved $62 million, crucial to balancing the budget, as a result of City employees foregoing scheduled salary increases.

The current system for setting City employee salaries locks the City into yearly automatic salary formulas and pay increases. Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State.

Most importantly, Proposition B requires evaluation of San Francisco's financial condition and ability to pay BEFORE setting wages and benefits for City workers.

- Proposition B allows for negotiation of wages and benefits for City and County employees.
- Proposition B will eliminate the automatic employee pay raises which increase the City's annual budget.
- Proposition B requires binding arbitration for peaceful resolution of labor disputes.
- Health insurance is such a basic necessity but many City employee families don't have adequate coverage. Proposition B allows City employees to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

VOTE YES on Proposition B to provide a fair, impartial, and fiscally responsible way to determine wages, health benefits and working conditions for City employees.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, former Police Chief Al Nelder, Rev. James McCray, School Board members Tom Ammiano and Carlotta del Portillo, Community College Governing Board President Mabel Teng, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco Police Officers Association, the San Francisco Firefighters, and the Central Labor Council urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor urge you to VOTE YES on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Behind the lofty words in Proposition B are the self-interests of the powerful political establishment in San Francisco. Proposition B will turn city unions into franchises to collect dues — but city workers will have no rights. Big Brother "arbitrators" will make all the important decisions.

Proposition B blurs the divergent interests of management and workers and erodes the basis of independent worker organization. Its purpose is to inhibit the ability of city workers to take defensive action.

Proposition B sets up a vertical, bureaucratic structure with no room for democratic participation. Proposition B hides with obscure, legal wording an anti-democratic viewpoint: negotiations behind closed doors, appointed highly paid arbitrators, extra pay for favored city bureaucrats. Thus it institutionalizes bureaucratic social control over city workers.

City workers have had to suffer through two wage freezes with no recourse to strike action. The Chamber of Commerce and its political friends are supporting Proposition B clearly in order to impose a third wage freeze. City workers have become the scapegoats for inefficient top-heavy city management and the failure of the established political structure to present any solutions to our social problems. This process of disempowerment ensures that workers and tax payers will be further denied a voice about their jobs and city services.

STOP BIG BROTHER CONTROL!
FOR REAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING!
NO ON B!

City Workers for Real Unionism

Earl Gilman

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

City workers need real collective bargaining. But Proposition B sets up compulsory arbitration — the opposite of collective bargaining. Though Proposition B contains a few "carrots" for workers, it is basically a "stick" which hands complete power over wages and fringe to a three person board of arbitrators. They are appointees — not democratically elected. Moreover, there is no mention in Proposition B how or when these arbitrators can be removed. City workers will be at the mercy of the "board." It is naive to assume this board — though claiming impartiality — will not be influenced by political pressure. In fact, the third person on this board — the tie breaking vote — will be one of the most powerful people in San Francisco.

Proposition B allows the board to meet "privately," which really means secretly, thus allowing for deals behind the backs of union members. Also hidden in the wording of Proposition B are special financial "incentives" for individual managers, who are already very well paid. Favoritism is almost inevitable, because Proposition B contains no controls on these pay-offs.

City unions will inevitably become appendages of the "board." In the Soviet Union workers once had unions like this — controlled by the state — but these workers now are demanding real unions including the right to strike.

Why are we going backwards in San Francisco while in the Soviet Union and other countries workers are demanding their rights? Many unions, unfortunately, have become businesses collecting dues from members and are no longer interested in organizing the unorganized. Under Proposition B, unions won't have to organize. Workers turn cynical and apathetic when wages are frozen and hiring freezes result in speed-up. Proposition B will reinforce this process with the result of turning our unions into company unions.

CITY WORKERS FOR REAL UNIONISM

Earl Gilman, Secretary

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a well-conceived, thoughtfully drafted reform. It is the result of hundreds of hours of negotiation and careful consideration.

Proposition B is fair to both the City as well as City workers.

Proposition B will allow the City to consider the overall budget picture rather than be locked into automatic salary pay increases and formulas. This will provide more flexibility in the budgetary process, and will assist in the maintenance of vital City services.

Proposition B will preclude strikes through the use of the peaceful method of arbitration.

Under Proposition B, City workers will be allowed to negotiate for salaries and health benefits, just like employees in the private sector.

A Yes Vote on Proposition B will help modernize an outdated salary setting system and will provide fiscally responsible reform.

Vote Yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Mixden, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

Proposition B will reform the city’s current salary setting process by allowing employees to negotiate for wages and benefits.

Your Yes vote on Proposition B, will insure that wage increases for city workers will be based upon the city’s ability to pay, not a rigid salary survey.

Proposition B requires that disputes be resolved by arbitration, not strikes. Charter prohibitions against strikes remain unchanged.

Proposition B provides a fair, impartial and fiscally responsible way to fix salaries and benefits.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Donald D. Doyle, President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Sonia Melara, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Harold M. Hoogasian, President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
James D. Jefferson, Past President, San Francisco Black Chamber of Commerce

Proposition B solves two of the City’s major problems by creating a much needed expansion of the collective bargaining process to include wage and benefits. In addition, Proposition B provides a one year wage freeze which will help resolve the City’s serious financial short-fall. In truth Proposition B is a “bridge over troubled waters”. A bridge constructed through the efforts of both City employees and City Government.

For far too long, San Francisco’s workers have been denied true collective bargaining.

Proposition B provides a choice for San Francisco Labor Unions to enter into the new collective bargaining program or to remain under the present formula system. Proposition B also saves the City at least 62 million dollars by acceptance of the wage freeze.

The Proposition B bridge was built through the tireless efforts of concerned citizens who are looking to a financially secure future while giving consideration to the basic rights of all citizens.

Approval of Proposition B will protect citizens from the flow of turbulent deficit waters. San Francisco voters have the power to place the last and most important piece in the bridge by voting Yes on Proposition B.

The San Francisco Labor Council strongly recommends a Yes vote on Proposition B.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition B. Today’s workforce has more women and more minorities, but our Charter locks in a system created when that wasn’t true. New issues important to today’s workers — child care, dental care, dependent health care, disability pay — shouldn’t be kept off the bargaining table because we locked in a system that reflected yesterday’s workforce issues. This measure recognizes the right of today’s workers to bargain for today’s needs.

Mayor Art Agnos

PROPOSITION B IS SOUND FISCAL REFORM

Proposition B is based on sound economic benefits to the City and to San Francisco taxpayers.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Presently, the City uses formulas and the combined salaries of what other Bay Area City’s pay their employees to set City employee wages. This locks the City in to pay increases regardless of the overall financial climate.

Proposition B places a provision in the City Charter that is badly needed, the provision that will require evaluation of San Francisco’s financial condition and it’s ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers.

With this safeguard, Proposition B creates a balanced salary setting plan for City and County workers. It gives City and County workers the ability to negotiate for an equitable wage and benefit plan and it provides fiscal checks and balances for the City.

Allowing City workers the ability to negotiate their salaries and benefits is a better way to do business than the “take it or leave it” approach that often results in strikes and conflicts.

Rigid salary formulas for all city workers drive annual increases far beyond the City’s ability to pay and have added tens of millions of dollars in needless expense to the City Budget. Proposition B will enable the City to hold the line on salaries.

To insure that the City’s employee salary setting standards remain on solid economic footing in the years to come, I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Louis J. Giraudo
President, San Francisco Bread Co.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

PROPOSITION B BRINGS FAIRNESS TO SAN FRANCISCO LABOR RELATIONS

We support Proposition B because it represents a fair and equitable form of labor relations for City workers.

Collective bargaining and binding arbitration are basic labor issues. Proposition B changes the current City employee salary setting standards to provide greater flexibility for City workers and their families.

Proposition B will provide, for the first time, the ability for City workers to negotiate for health benefits for their families. This is a basic necessity whose time has come.

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Proposition B will bring San Francisco in line with other Bay Area cities and counties who already allow their workers to negotiate through collective bargaining and binding arbitration.

For fairness, equity, and flexibility, we urge you to support Proposition B.

VOTE YES ON PROP B.

San Francisco Labor Council
SEIU, Local 790
SEIU, Local 250
S.F. Firefighters
San Francisco Police Officers Association

Proposition B is reasonable and responsible change worthy of your support and your vote.

Proposition B changes the current system for setting salaries that mandates automatic salary formulas and pay increases and provides for collective bargaining, the process by which the City and City employees will be able to negotiate wage and health benefits. Isn't it only fair for City employees to have the same right to negotiate wages and health benefits that exists in the private sector?

Proposition B is a sensible plan that will preclude strikes.

Proposition B is fiscally responsible reform. It has safeguards to help protect the City during difficult economic times.

Please join me in voting for Proposition B.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE

Proposition B makes good sense from a City management, City employee, and an economic point of view.

That is why we urge you to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY MANAGEMENT

Proposition B makes good sense for City management because it will require evaluation of San Francisco's financial condition and it's ability to pay prior to the setting of yearly wage and benefits for City workers. That is just good business sense.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE FOR CITY EMPLOYEES

Proposition B makes good sense for City employees because it gives them the same rights to negotiate for wages and benefits which employees throughout the State already have. And, it gives them the ability to choose better health coverage for their families instead of pay increases. At a time when so many families need better health coverage, this is a sensible option.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD ECONOMIC SENSE

Proposition B makes good economic sense because it will change the rigid salary formulas which currently lock the City in each year regardless of the budget realities, pitting them against the many vital services the City needs to have money to pay for.

Proposition B is a well thought out compromise plan which will meet the needs of the City and provide fairness to City employees.

PROPOSITION B MAKES GOOD SENSE.

Please join us in voting yes on Proposition B.

Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Senator Milton Marks
Assemblymember John Burton
City Attorney Louise Renne
Civil Service Commissioner A. Lee Munson
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Naomi Gray
Nancy C. Lenzin, Former Public Utilities Commissioner
PROPOSITION B WILL HELP FAMILIES RECEIVE AFFORDABLE HEALTH BENEFITS

Today, over SIX MILLION CALIFORNIANS have no health insurance at all, and millions more have inadequate health coverage for themselves and their families.

It seems fair that City employees would have the option of choosing to negotiate for affordable health benefits for their families rather than salary increases. Until now, that has not been possible.

Proposition B will provide City employees with the ability to negotiate for health benefits for their families.

That is why we urge you to VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Proposition B is meaningful reform. In the current economic climate, Proposition B is timely. Virtually all other counties throughout the Bay Area already allow their employees these rights and benefits. Proposition B will move the City forward in a positive direction.

This year, the City was able to save $62 million in the budget through employees foregoing salary increases. Providing a more equitable salary and health benefit plan for City employees in the future will go a long way towards providing fiscal flexibility for the City and fairness to its employees.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Joseph P. Lacey, Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
Lulu Carter, 1st Vice Chair, Democratic Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Pres., Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Sharon Eberhardt, President, Greater Mission Democratic Club

PROPOSITION B IS FAIR AND SENSIBLE REFORM

San Francisco has a proud history for fairness and for sensible reform.

Proposition B is sensible reform timely and in the best interests of San Francisco taxpayers, and to the City employees we depend on to provide critical services we have come to expect.

That is why we urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

This year the City saved $62 million because of City employees foregoing salary increases. But without meaningful changes, this will only be a one-year fix for a more fundamental issue.

Proposition B allows employees the right to negotiate wages and health benefits, like other employees throughout the State. It is an equitable plan which has taken into consideration what is best for the City and contains a number of safeguards to make sure that the City’s economic position is protected in all negotiations.

And, at a time when affordable health insurance is such a basic necessity for all families, Proposition B will allow City employees the ability to negotiate for health benefits as opposed to salary increases. This is only fair.

I had the responsibility for protecting the City’s economic well-being and worked under a different salary setting standard.

Proposition B is the sensible and fair, fiscally responsible reform needed at this time in the City’s history.

I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition B.

Former San Francisco Mayor Joseph L. Alioto

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

Vote No — "B" is an outrageous proposal concocted by the mayor and municipal workers' unions to raid our treasury on behalf of 46,000 active and retired Municipal workers.

Vote No — it takes from the voters and gives the mayor and workers' unions power to invalidate all voter laws regulating duties, hours, conditions and benefits of workers.

Vote No — it forces workers to join a union. It sets up a 3 tiered system of setting all compensations and conditions, giving workers the choice of the system in the workers' best interest, not the taxpayers'.

Vote "B" No — Supervisors will never select impartial arbitrators. During the past two strikes Supervisors picked arbitrators selected by the unions. I know. I was there.

Vote No — Current laws regulating compensations are fair to workers and taxpayers. Not once since these laws were adopted by the voters in 1976 have they been adhered to. What we really need is someone to sue the mayor and Board to forcing them to follow the law.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor

Proposition B is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It has been broadly propagandized to San Francisco taxpayers as a cost saver. It is nothing of the sort; it eliminates almost all the limitations upon the power of the incumbent Mayor and Board of Supervisors to grant approximately 29,000 public employees unprecedented salaries, benefits and other favors. The Charter limitation of like pay for like work is eliminated and replaced with glittering generalities. The Charter requirement of voter approval of a dental plan is circumvented by a legal artifice which, according to the Controller, will cost $13,000,000 per year. An expensive additional bureaucracy is established for purposes of binding arbitration if an impasse occurs between employee organizations and the City. None of the arbitrators need be a public official accountable to the taxpayers of San Francisco; none need even live in San Francisco! Proposition B also creates another City employee relations board although we already have such a board in the Civil Service Commission. That's why the Controller states that Proposition B will increase costs in "a presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount." Finally, it allows certain public employees two additional paid holidays for three years beginning in 1992 at a cost of approximately $1,000,000 per year and effectively eliminates the requirement of voter approval to increase benefits or change working conditions.

Proposition B is unjustified and I urge a "NO" vote.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

I strongly support collective bargaining, but Proposition B is a bad deal for the City. Proposition B means collective bargaining only for some employees. Proposition B retains our old salary setting method that has caused inflated wages for our employees.

Wage reform must be universal and fair to employees and the City. Proposition B is not a reform. The City will incur enormous costs from using two salary methods. Massive tax increases will be needed to pay for this election year giveaway by Art Agnos to his favorite union buddies.

Do not be misled. Vote NO on Proposition B!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The City Charter currently provides that the salaries of approximately 29,000 City, School District and Community College employees are based on a survey of salaries paid elsewhere for similar work. Like pay for like work is the principle. Salaries and fringe benefits currently amount to just less than half the total 1991-92 budget.

Now, as part of a “budget agreement” for fiscal year 1991-92, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors would have us approve a more expensive arrangement. In addition to permitting public employee unions to negotiate salaries, benefits and working conditions, Proposition B expressly allows binding salary setting, benefit and working condition decisions by non-public officials, non-residents (who are accountable to no one), two additional City employee paid holidays for three years, at a cost of $1,000,000 per year and a dental plan which alone will cost the City an extra $13,000,000 per year, according to the City Controller. Raising salary and compensatory benefit discretion in the present Board of Supervisors and Mayor is just asking for financial trouble, especially with almost final decision-making power in non-elected "arbitrators" who account to no one and needn't even live in our City!

A memorandum of understanding with the City allows the unions, even those that opt for collective bargaining, to use the old formulas next year to catch up from the 1991-92 wage freeze. According to budget analyst Harvey Rose, "Employees will receive salary standardization . . . and, in addition, may receive further adjustments from the outcome of the collective bargaining for 1992-93."

If you believe that our current system treats City workers fairly, you'll vote against this costly measure.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5 and 8.409-6 relating to rights and obligations of employees and employer concerning bargaining and impartial arbitration of employment disputes for miscellaneous employees.

The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Sections 8.409, 8.409-1, 8.409-2, 8.409-3, 8.409-4, 8.409-5, and 8.409-6 to read as follows:

NOTE: These Sections are entirely new.
Part 1A: Rights and Obligations of Employees and Employer Concerning Collective Bargaining and Impartial Arbitration of Employment Disputes
8.409 Declaration of Policy
It is hereby declared to be the policy of the city and county of San Francisco that strikes by city employees are not in the public interest and that, in accordance with Government Code Section 3507(e), a method should be adopted for peacefully and equitably resolving disputes. It is the further purpose and policy of the city and county of San Francisco that in the event the procedures herein adopted are invoked by the city and county of San Francisco or by a recognized employee organization representing employees covered by this part, except as otherwise provided herein, they shall supersede and displace all other formulae, procedures and provisions relating to wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment found in this charter, in the ordinances and resolutions of the city and county of San Francisco, or in the rules, regulations or actions of boards or commissions of the city and county of San Francisco.

The provisions of charter section 8.346 shall remain in full force and effect and shall not be subject to the provisions of this part.
In accordance with applicable state law, nothing herein shall be construed to restrict any legal city rights concerning direction of its work force, or consideration of the merits, necessity, or organization of any service or activity provided by the
City. The City shall also have the right to determine the mission of its constituent departments, officers, boards and commissions; set standards of services to be offered to the public; and exercise control and discretion over the city's organization and operations. The City may also relieve city employees from duty due to lack of work or funds, and may determine the methods, means and personnel by which the city's operations are to be conducted.

However, the exercise of such rights does not preclude employees or their representatives from utilizing the grievance procedure to process grievances regarding the practical consequences of any such actions on wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment whenever memoranda of understanding providing a grievance procedure are in full force and effect.

It is the declared intent of the voters that the state statutes referenced in this part be those in effect on the effective date of this part.

8.409-1 Employees Covered

These Sections 8.409 through 8.409-6, inclusive, shall apply to miscellaneous employees as described in Section 8.409-4 of this charter and including employees of San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Any recognized employee organization, on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect not later than January 3, 1992 to have wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment set pursuant to this part. Thereafter, any recognized employee organization which has remained within the coverage of Sections 8.409-1 and 8.409-7 on behalf of all employees in each and every classification it represents, may elect to be covered by this part; provided however, such election shall be effective nine months from the date of that election. Any election to be covered by this part shall thereafter be irrevocable, and affected classifications will not thereafter be subject to the provisions of sections 8.409-1 and 8.409-7 of this charter. Employees in classifications represented by a recognized employee organization which does not opt to be covered by this part shall continue to be covered by the provisions of sections 8.409-1 and 8.409-7 of this charter and such classifications shall not be covered by any of the provisions of this part.

Nothing herein shall preclude a recognized employee organization from electing to include employees in classifications covered by section 8.409-4 of this Charter within the coverage of this part as a separate bargaining unit, provided however, that the election shall be irrevocable and such employees shall not thereafter be subject to the provisions of section 8.409-4.

Employees in classifications not represented by a recognized employee organization as of January 3, 1992 shall be entitled to represent themselves with the city and county over wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment to the extent required by state law and shall not be subject to the provisions of Sections 8.409-1 and 8.409-4, or the arbitration provisions of Section 8.409-4 of this charter. The Mayor annually shall propose all forms of compensation for unrepresented employees including salaries, hours, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment subject to approval or disapproval of the board of supervisors. Consistent with other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission may adopt rules and procedures relating to said unrepresented employees.

In addition, subject to the approval or disapproval of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor may create, for employees designated as management, a management compensation package that recognizes and provides incentives for outstanding managerial performance contributing to increased productivity and efficiency in the work force. In formulating such a package, the Mayor shall take into account data developed in conjunction with the civil service commission regarding the terms of executive compensation in other public and private jurisdictions.

8.409-2 Interim Provisions

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.409-4 of this charter, from January 3, 1992 through March 31, 1992, in return for acceptance of a wage freeze for fiscal year 1991-92, all recognized employee organizations representing classifications electing to remain within the coverage of charter sections 8.409-1 and 8.409-7 may, on a one time only basis, elect to bargain for no more than two additional paid training or furlough days per year to be effective only in fiscal years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95, and a dental plan, in recognition of the wage freeze for 1991-92. Such bargaining shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided herein or any other provision of the charter, ordinance, or state law.

8.409-3 Obligation to Bargain in Good Faith

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, or of the ordinances, rules or regulations of the city and county of San Francisco and its departments, boards and commissions, the city and county of San Francisco, through its duly authorized representatives, and recognized employee organizations representing classifications of employees covered by this part shall have the mutual obligation to bargain in good faith on all matters within the scope of representation as defined by Government Code section 3504, relating to the wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of city and county employment, including the establishment of procedures for the resolution of grievances concerning the interpretation or application of any agreement, and including agreements to provide binding arbitration of discipline and discharge; provided, however that, except insofar as they affect compensation, those matters within the jurisdiction of the civil service commission which establish, implement and regulate the civil service merit system shall not be subject to bargaining under this part: the authority, purposes, definitions, administration and organization of the merit system and the civil service commission; policies, procedures and funding of the operations of the civil service commission and its staff; the establishment and maintenance of a classification plan including the classification and reclassification of positions and the allocation and reallocation of positions to the various classifications; status rights; the establishment of standards, procedures and qualifications for employment, recruitment, application, examination, selection, certification and appointment; the establishment, administration and duration of eligible lists; probationary status and the administration of probationary periods, except duration; pre-employment and fitness for duty medical examinations except for the conditions under which referrals for fitness for duty examinations will be made, and the imposition of new requirements; the designation of positions as exempt, temporary, limited tenure, part-time, seasonal or permanent; resignation with satisfactory service and reappointment; exempt entry level appointment of the handicapped; approval of payrolls; and conflict of interest. Nothing in this paragraph shall limit the obligation of the civil service commission to meet and confer as appropriate under state law.

Unless and until agreement is reached through bargaining between authorized representatives of the city and county of San Francisco and authorized representatives of recognized employee organizations for the employee classifications covered by this part, or a determination is made through the procedure set forth in section 8.409-4 hereinafter provided, no existing wages, written terms or conditions of employment, fringe benefits, or long-standing past practices for said employees shall be altered, eliminated, or changed except in cases of emergency. This paragraph shall be effective only until the approval of the first memorandum of understanding with a covered employee organization or six months from the effective date of this part whichever occurs sooner.

During the term of an MOU, disputes regarding changes in wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be subject to the impasse procedures provided in this part, but may be subject to grievance arbitration.

No bargaining unit may be included in more than one memorandum of understanding with the city and county of San Francisco. Departmental or bargaining unit memoranda of understanding operative on the effective date of this part shall continue in effect until their expiration date or for three years, whichever occurs first, and may be renewed thereafter only as part of a master citywide memorandum of understanding.

Agreements reached pursuant to this part by the authorized representatives for the city and county of San Francisco, on behalf of its departments, boards and commissions, and the authorized representatives of recognized employee organizations, once adopted by the board of supervisors, shall be binding on the city and county of San Francisco, and on its departments, boards, commissions, officers and employees and on the recognized employee organizations and their successors, and all employees in classifications they represent. Except as specifically set forth in this part, said agreements shall supersede any and all other conflicting procedures, provisions and formulae contained in this charter, in the ordinances of the board of supervisors, or in the rules or regulations of boards or commissions of the city and county of San Francisco, relating to
wages, hours, or other terms and conditions of employment.

8.409-4 Impasse Resolution Procedures
(a) Subject to Section 8.409-4(g), disputes pertaining to wages, hours, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment which remain unresolved after good faith bargaining between the city and county of San Francisco, on behalf of its departments, boards and commissions, and a recognized employee organization representing classifications of employees covered under this part shall be submitted to a three-member mediation/arbitration board ("the board") upon the declaration of an impasse either by the authorized representative of the city and county of San Francisco or by the designated representative of the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute.

(b) Not later than January 20 of any year in which bargaining on an MOU takes place, representatives designated by the city and county of San Francisco and representatives of the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining pursuant to this part shall each select and appoint one person to the board. The third member of the board shall be selected by agreement between the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization, and shall serve as the neutral chairperson of the board.

In the event that the city and county of San Francisco and the recognized employee organization involved in bargaining cannot agree upon the selection of the chairperson within ten (10) days after the selection of the city and county and employee organization members of the board, either party may then request the American Arbitration Association or California State Media- tion Service to provide a list of the seven (7) persons who are qualified and experienced as labor interest arbitrators. If the city and county and the employee organization cannot agree within three (3) days after receipt of such list on one of the seven (7) persons to act as the chairperson, they shall randomly determine which party strikes first, and shall alternately strike names from the list of nominees until one name remains and that person shall then become the chairperson of the board.

(c) Any proceeding convened pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformance with, subject to, and governed by Title 9 of Part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The board may hold public hearings, receive evidence from the parties and, at the request of either party, cause a transcript of the proceedings to be prepared. The board, in the exercise of its discretion, may meet privately with the parties to mediate or mediate/arbitrate the dispute. The board may also adopt other procedures designed to encourage an agreement between the parties, expedite the arbitration hearing process, or reduce the cost of the arbitration process.

(d) In the event no agreement is reached prior to the conclusion of the arbitration hearings, the board shall direct each of the parties to submit, within such time limit as the board may establish, a package last offer of settlement on the remaining issues in dispute. The board shall by majority vote decide which package most nearly conforms to those factors traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of public and private employment, including, but not limited to: changes in the average consumer price index for goods and services; the wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment of employees performing similar services; the wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment of other employees in the city and county of San Francisco; health and safety of employees; the financial resources of the city and county of San Francisco; other demands on the city and county's resources; revenue projections; the power to levy taxes and raise revenue by enhancements or other means; budgetary reserves; and limitations on the amount and use of revenue and expenditures.

The board, by majority vote, shall enter a written decision selecting the package of one or the other party in its entirety.

(e) To be effective the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year, an agreement shall be reached or the board shall reach a final decision no later than sixty days before the date the Mayor is required to submit a budget to the board of supervisors, except by mutual agreement of the parties. After reaching a decision, the board shall serve by certified mail or by hand delivery a true copy of its decision to the parties. Except as otherwise provided by this part, the arbitration decision shall supersede any and all other relevant formulae, procedures and provisions of this charter relating to wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment, and it shall be final and binding on the parties to the dispute. However, the decision of the board may be challenged by either party pursuant to Title 9 of part 3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

Within 8 working days of the board's issuance of its written decision, the authorized representative of either party may appeal from the decision of the board to the board of supervisors. The appeal shall be filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors and served on the other party by the clerk. The board of supervisors may reject the decision of the board within 21 days of the filing of any appeal. Subject to the provisions of this section, if the board's decision is not overruled by a motion of the board of supervisors on a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3), the decision shall become final and binding. Should the board of supervisors overrule the decision of the arbitration board, the last best offer package of the other party shall become effective. Thereafter, the city and county of San Francisco, its designated officers, employees and representatives and the recognized employee organization involved in the dispute shall take whatever action necessary to carry out and effectuate the final decision.

(f) The expenses of any proceedings convened pursuant to this part, including the fee for the services of the chairperson of the board, the costs of preparation of the transcript of the proceedings and other costs related to the conduct of the proceedings, as determined by the board, shall be borne equally by the parties. All other expenses which the parties may incur are to be borne by the party incurring such expenses.

(g) The impasse resolution procedures set forth in Section 8.409-4, or in any other provision of the charter, ordinance or state law shall not apply to any rule, policy, procedure, order or practice which relates or pertains to the purpose, goals or requirements of a consent decree, or which is necessary to ensure compliance with federal, state or local laws, ordinances or regulations. In the event the city acts on a matter it has determined relates to or pertains to a consent decree, or in the event the city acts to ensure compliance with federal, state, or local laws, ordinances or regulations, and the affected employee organization disputes said determination, that determination or action shall not be subject to arbitration, but may be challenged in a court of competent jurisdiction.

8.409-5 Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, retirement and death allowances shall continue to be set and adjusted pursuant to Chapter Five of this Article.

However, death benefits and survivor allowances, retirement allowances, adjustments to retirement allowances and adjustments to subsequent allowances payable by the retirement system and based on fiscal year 1991-1992 wages and salaries covered by charter sections 8,407, shall be calculated for all employees covered by charter sections 8,401 and 8,407 based on the rates certified by the civil service commission to the board of supervisors as though the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance vetoed by the mayor had become law. No such payment shall exceed the maximum amount permitted by Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, or the maximum amount which would still permit the retirement system to preserve its tax-qualified status under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

After June 30, 1992, adjustments to retirement allowances and any subsequent allowances shall not be greater than they would have been had the 1991-1992 salary standardization ordinance vetoed by the mayor become law.

8.409-6 Employee Relations Rules
Within sixty (60) days of adoption of this amendment, the Mayor shall appoint a panel which after consultation with all parties of interest, shall review the current employee relations ordinance and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for such changes as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this part. Such changes shall not include creation of an employee relations board. The duties of the employees relations board shall include hearing and making determinations concerning unfair labor practice charges, disputes regarding representation matters, and unit determinations.
PROPOSITION C

Shall certain Civil Service hiring regulations be removed from the Charter and placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period are part of the Charter. The Charter can be changed only by the voters. Other employment rules are in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission can change these Rules after public hearings. Generally, the City must also meet and confer with employee organizations representing employees affected by the rule changes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would remove from the Charter the rules on qualification of applicants for City employment, tests, lists of persons eligible to become employees, certain temporary appointments and dismissal of employees during their probationary period and place them in the Rules of the Civil Service Commission. This measure would allow these rules to be changed by the Civil Service Commission after public hearings and, where required, meeting and conferring with employee organizations.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove these rules from the Charter and place them in the Civil Service Commission Rules.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep these rules in the Charter.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Since this measure takes charter provisions which at present can only be changed by a vote of the electorate and incorporates them as Civil Service Rules which may be administratively revised, in my opinion, there is no direct cost effect. However, future rule changes could increase or decrease costs in presently indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Bill Maher.
Civil Service Rules

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

As part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, we need Proposition C to begin the long-overdue modernization of our Civil Service operations.

During the past year, the Civil Service Commission conducted an in-depth study of ways to improve operations and reduce costs. The Commission conducted four months of public hearings, listening to hundreds of individual’s testimony.

The Commission concluded, “The present Civil Service Charter provisions lead to excessive delays, red tape, and millions of dollars of unproductive operating expenses for City Departments.” With the passage of Propositions C, D and E, the Commission estimates the City workforce could be reduced by 2%, for an annual savings of $20 to $30 million.

Proposition C modernizes some of the archaic personnel procedures now in the Charter. Ten Charter sections consisting of detailed personnel rules would become Civil Service Commission Rules. These Rules would be updated by the Commission.

The Commission would continue as appropriate to hold public hearings and meet and confer sessions with employee organizations before making any changes in these Rules.

The ten Charter sections that would become Commission Rules deal with qualification of applicants, examinations, protests of exams and eligible lists, examination procedures for veterans and employees on military leave, duration of eligible lists, limited tenure appointments, temporary and emergency appointments and dismissals during the probation period.

Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to insure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition C will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Don’t be tricked. In recent years the Civil Service Commission has abandoned its role as an independent enforcement agency. It is now a rubber-stamp commission that allows political appointees to do whatever they want — at great cost.

Gone is fairness in the top levels of City employment. Back is favoritism. People with the right friends have the most access to high-paying City jobs; and Civil Service does nothing to prevent this.

The departments are the ones claiming “cost savings” because they want a free hand to pick whomever they want for City jobs. The Chamber of Commerce wants you to vote for this so they can get their friends City jobs.

Civil Service is supposed to make sure that jobs are filled from lists of qualified candidates. Civil Service is responsible for exams, so if any candidate who makes the list is not qualified, it’s the Commission’s own fault.

Civil Service has also neglected to develop certain lists altogether, particularly for top positions. That way, the departments can choose whomever they like for lucrative jobs.

If the Commission were doing what the Charter mandates, we wouldn't have so many high-paid, overlapping bureaucracies.

We are not afraid of change; we are afraid of what will happen if you give the Commission, and by extension the Mayor and his department heads, a free hand in hiring.

We need our resources to go toward services, not patronage.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

Don't be mislead by fancy words and false promises.
Under the guise of "modernizing civil service," this proposition opens the door to political patronage in City employment.
Voters have spoken on this issue many times — as recently as last November, when "exemptions" for top deputies in the Public Utilities Commission were handily defeated. The last time the City tried to sneak these same "modernizations" past the electorate, you voted it down overwhelmingly.
This proposal will not correct problems in Charter rules; The real problem is the City's failure to live within the rules.
This measure will not save money — it will cost money. Lots of it. The payroll will become further bloated with high-paid political appointments, exempt and "temporary" positions — all of which cost real money. This diverts funds from necessary services to reward friends of department heads and politicians.
The real reform that is needed is for the City to live within the merit system by providing regular, non-biased civil service exams, not by giving the people in power the right to change the rules to meet their whims.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C — stop political patronage.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Propositions C, D and E will begin the process of modernizing the Civil Service System — a job that is long overdue.
Under current rules, an individual who scored 70% on a test must be hired, even though there are candidates for this job who scored 95% the next time a test was given.
The opponents of Proposition C agree the system isn't working. Yet they urge you to maintain the status quo. That doesn't make good business sense.
Proposition C, D and E, the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, could save the City an estimated $20 million to $30 million a year in unnecessary spending, while broadening job opportunities.
Proposition C will not eliminate checks and balances written into the Charter to ensure fairness and equity in the current hiring and firing policies. It will not affect the merit system. It will in no way encourage or increase patronage. Proposition C has nothing to do with the number of exempt appointments or high-paying jobs in City Government.
Proposition C will begin the process of modernizing the inefficient, slow and costly personnel procedures currently being used. The public hearing process, before the independent Civil Service Commission, will be maintained to ensure the fairness of the process. Allowing personnel procedures to be updated through public hearings and meetings DOES NOT increase patronage.
Vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

For good government and a modern personnel system, support transfer of Civil Service procedures from the Charter to Commission rules.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition C, will reform the city’s outdated civil service system, without harming merit hiring protections.

The Charter currently restricts the Civil Service Commission’s ability to produce examinations and lists of job applicants in a timely way.

Proposition C will give greater flexibility to the Commission, reducing the costs of operating the examination process while producing better hiring lists.

Join business, labor and our elected officials in voting Yes on Proposition C.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

City workers ought to be able to bargain over workplace rules. Currently our system is so rigid that it takes years to offer exams for positions. Vote “yes” to modernize our out-of-date system.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- BROADER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGED YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D and E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is not reform — it’s a power grab!

San Francisco government hardly needs more politics in its hiring practices.

The mayor repeatedly abuses his hiring authority. He circumvents merit selection, favors outsiders, and creates fat-salaried posts for political patronage.

Proposition C is the latest power grab!

San Francisco was spilling with red budget ink this year. City workers went without raises, and deep cuts were made in health programs. Despite these sacrifices, the mayor created a new — $120,000.00 — position in Civil Service.

Why? So Mayor Agnos could replace the general manager with his own political appointee — while keeping the old general manager on payroll. We’re now paying two people the salary of general manager!

More padding is going on at Social Services and Health Departments.

Imagine the outcome if the merit selection laws are stripped away.

Proposition C is a power grab!

Richard D. Hongisto, Assessor

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, relating to qualifications, examinations, eligible lists, provisional appointments and dismissal during probation, and adding new section 8.320-1 incorporating the provisions of the above sections into Civil Service Commission rules.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by deleting sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.328, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 thereof, and adding new section 8.320-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.320-1 Incorporating Former Charter Provisions

The provisions of the following sections of the Charter, in the form existing prior to November 1, 1991, shall be incorporated in the rules of the Civil Service Commission, and shall remain in effect until or unless amended by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to its charter authority and subject to any applicable meet and confer or bargaining requirements under state law.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants
8.321 Examination of Applicants
8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers
8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles
8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations
8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave
8.330 Duration of List of Eligibles
8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments
8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments
8.340 Dismissal during Probationary Period
8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by Section 8.100 of this Chapter may submit himself or herself for any examination under conditions established by the Civil Service Commission.

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed forces 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 at the time of appointment.

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed forces 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 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 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. (Amended November, 1986)

8.321 Examination of Applicants

All applicants for places in the classified service shall submit to examinations which shall be competitive provided, however, that no examination shall be deemed to be competitive unless two or more persons shall participate, except that any such exam shall be held for qualified applicants on recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors, upon finding by the board that reasonable publicity of the proposed examination has been given. Such examinations shall be without charge to the applicants. The commission shall control all examinations and may employ suitable persons in- or out-of-the-public service to act as examiners. The examinations shall measure the relative capacities of the persons examined to perform the functions, duties and responsibilities of the classification to which they seek appointment. Examinations shall consist of selection techniques which will test fairly the relative qualifications, merit and fitness of the applicants for the position to be filled.

Examinations may include written tests to determine job-related aptitude, knowledge, or achievements and oral tests by qualifications appraisal boards. The Civil Service Commission shall establish rules governing the size and composition of qualification appraisal board. Qualification appraisal boards may consider, in the case of employees of the city and county of San Francisco, all prior performance evaluations completed on civil service forms and in the case of all applicants may as part of their evaluation of candidates for employment to any position. Appropriate rosters of eligibles established by a trade, craft or occupation joint apprenticeship committee, such as the California Building Trades Council or the State Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards, may be utilized to fill apprenticeship positions or as the basis for establishing apprenticeship eligibility lists. The commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of the tests to rate the capacity of the applicants to perform service for the city and county. The commission may, for each examination, establish a passing mark or may determine the total number of persons who shall constitute the list of eligibles. The commission shall prepare from the returns of the examiners the list of eligibles, arranged in order of relative performance. No question submitted to applicants shall refer to political or religious opinions or fraternal affiliations. (Amended Nov., 1978)

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written tests. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made. (Amended Nov., 1976)

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

For the purpose of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three working days for entrance examinations or five working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period, a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the City Civil Service Commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors. The fee shall be paid by any person who wishes to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligible's rank and score, except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test, shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If so protests are received during the posting period, the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period, the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond 60 days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from the eligible list pending final adoption of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list. (Amended Nov., 1976)

8.324 Veterans Preference in Examinations

Veterans with 30 days or more actual service, and widows or widowers of such veterans, who become eligible for appointment by obtaining the passing mark in any entrance examination, shall be allowed an additional credit of five percent in making up the list of eligibles established by such examination. The term "veteran" as used in this section shall be taken to mean any person who has been mustered into, or served in, or enlisted in the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Army Air Corps, the United States Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard, and served on active duty in said branch of the armed forces of the United States, not including reserve service, at any time for a period of 30 days or more in time of war and been separated from active duty and under conditions other than dis
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honorable and not resulting from court martial; except no individual entering the armed forces on or after January 27, 1973, the date of the creation of the volunteer army, shall receive veterans preference in a civil service entrance examination for service of any type in the armed forces of the United States. In addition, an individual qualifying for veterans preference and who is determined to be permanently disabled on his or her date of separation from active duty in the armed forces, no person so qualified shall be granted veterans preference unless he or she indicates qualification therefor on an examination application received by the Civil Service Commission not later than 10 years from the date of his or her first entitlement thereto. When an eligible has secured a permanent appointment from a list of eligibles derived from an entrance examination, in which he or she has been allowed additional credits of five percent, he or she shall have secured the full probationary period therein as provided in this Charter, such other additional credits of five percent that have been allowed him or her on the list of eligibles, derived from other entrance examinations shall be automatically cancelled, and his or her rank on such other list or lists revised to accord with his or her relative standing before such additional credits were added and he or she shall not be allowed such additional credits in any other examinations. The Civil Service Commission may, for services or employment specified by the commission, allow general or individual preference, but not more than 10 percent, for entrance appointment of veterans who have suffered permanent disability in the line of duty, provided that such disability would not prevent the proper performance of the duties required under such service, or employment, and provided that such disability is on record in the United States Veterans’ Administration.

Definition of Time of War

In the administration hereafter of the provisions of this section of this Charter, the expression “time of war” shall include the following periods of time:

(a) the period of time from the commencement of a war as shown by any declaration of war of the Congress of the United States, or by any statute or resolution of the Congress, a purpose of which is to declare in any manner the existence of a state of war, until the time of termination thereof by any treaty or cessation of hostilities otherwise;

(b) the period of time during which the United States is or has been engaged in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared;

(c) the period of time during which the United States is or has been assisting the United Nations or any nation or nations in accordance with existing treaties, obligations, in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared; and

(d) the period of time during which the United States is engaged in a campaign or expedition in which a medal has been authorized by the government of the United States, provided, however, that no person shall be eligible for the benefits provided for veterans in this section unless he shall have been eligible to receive such a medal.

8.326 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of service in the United States armed forces after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in Section 8.324 of this Charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is herein referred to as the original promotional examination, shall, after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the Civil Service Commission within 30 days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within 30 days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The Civil Service Commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examinations within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The Civil Service Commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or more than the minimum passing mark established by the Civil Service Commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereafter be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination, in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employee shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period, as provided in Section 8.310 of this Charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the Civil Service Commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared therein, then such employee, upon application for permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared therein, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations as herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The Civil Service Commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after five years have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.326 hereof, the Civil Service Commission may qualifiy applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by the rule of the Civil Service Commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to determine the qualifications of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled—pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only
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until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.339 heretofore but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the Civil Service Commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 thereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as set forth in this section may not be reappointed by reason of such service acquire any right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this Charter or by rule of the Civil Service Commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.339 of the Charter. Service after January 1, 1951, under limited tenure appointment, by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.339 of this Charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The Civil Service Commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.339 heretofore.

The Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and approval of the Board of Supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after receipt by the Board of Supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the Civil Service Commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding 130 working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond 90 days are approved as authorized by the Civil Service Commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 130 working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.339 of this Charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified, the appointing officer shall report for duty as provided in Section 8.339 of this Charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding 30 working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such 30 working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.339 of this Charter. The commission shall not be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment for the period exceeding 90 days, the employee and the Civil Service Commission shall specify the reasons for such appointment. The employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the Civil Service Commission. The commission shall render a decision within 30 days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may rescind such person dismissed or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he was promoted and may recalculate the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or a similar classification under such conditions as the commission shall find to be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the Civil Service Commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Civil Service Commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.
MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote.
Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.

Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?
Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting
October 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
Civil Service Eligibles

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Charter be amended to give the same hiring rights to all applicants with the same score on a civil service list, and shall the Civil Service Commission be authorized to adopt rules increasing the number of applicants on a civil service list who may be considered for employment?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Persons who apply for City jobs must take a test to measure their qualifications. Applicants who pass the test are placed on a list ranked from the highest score to the lowest. Ties are broken by lottery. City departments may hire any of the top three persons on the list. This is known as the rule of three. This rule is in the Charter, and the Charter can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would allow any one of the persons with the top three scores on a list to be hired. Under Proposition D ties in test scores would not be broken. This means there could be more than three persons with the top three scores.

This is known as the rule of three scores. Proposition D would give the Civil Service Commission the authority to adopt rules allowing additional qualified applicants on a list to be considered. The Civil Service Commission could adopt such rules only after a process that includes public hearings and meeting and conferring with employee organizations when required. These rule changes would no longer require a change in the Charter.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the City’s hiring process.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.
Civil Service Eligibles

PROponent’s ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

A major part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform package, Proposition D revises the “Rule of Three” and in the process will save the City millions of dollars annually by eliminating unnecessary temporary positions.

The “Rule of Three” requires departments to hire from only three names in filling a position. When candidates have identical exam scores, one candidate is arbitrarily ranked above another, using a lottery based on social security numbers.

Because most managers find this too restrictive and too difficult to hire the best qualified person for a job, they often add positions and hire temporary employees who they believe can get the job done. This adds millions of dollars annually to the City’s costs.

Proposition D will end this spending, and in the process, make City government operate more efficiently.

Under Proposition D departments will be able to choose from all candidates with the highest three scores. With tie scores occurring on 25% of exams, departments will have more candidates to choose from.

Other Bay Area cities already allow more candidates to be considered for a job. San Jose uses the number of vacancies plus ten additional names, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties use the seven highest scores.

San Francisco has 1,700 job classifications, more than the Federal government. With these new standards, the Civil Service Commission will create fewer, broader classifications. Proposition D will allow departments to choose from more candidates to find the best person for the job.

Allowing more candidates for a job will expand opportunities for City employees, help departments meet equal opportunity employment goals and reduce the cost of City government.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

It’s true — the Civil Service Commission’s most important job is preventing patronage — too bad they haven’t done so.

The City payroll is more loaded down with political appointments than ever before, even though the Civil Service Commission is supposed to protect the citizenry from employment abuses.

What the politicians and their appointees think of as “red tape” are the very same voter-approved Charter provisions that keep political patronage in check.

Send a message to the City that you would rather have them live within the reasonable Charter rules for hiring than spend time devising end runs around the rules.

Protect merit hiring — tell the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, their commissioners and department heads that you don’t like City employment treated as a private club.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

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

This proposition opens the door to political patronage.
If you want to give politicians and their appointees power to hand
out jobs, vote for this proposition.
If you want to ensure fair, non-political civil service employ-
ment, VOTE NO ON D.

Buried in verbiage about breaking tie scores is a long-standing
attempt to eliminate Charter-mandated rules that protect fair em-
ployment in City government.
Maybe the City thought voters wouldn’t notice that this proposi-
tion is the same as Prop C. Either measure will take rules regulating
civil service employment out of the Charter and place them in the
hands of politicians and their appointees.
One California city has a “rule of three scores” but department
heads must provide written justification for choosing anyone other
than the top candidate for the job. The result is that 90 percent of
all promotions go to the top candidates — because the reasons for
appointing someone else are almost always political.
Don’t be misled. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Protect
civil service employment from political influence.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains safeguards to ensure fair, non-political
civil service employment. It will help to eliminate the current
practice of adding extra jobs or hiring temporary employees, which
adds millions of dollars to City expenses annually and makes
government work less efficiently.

Prop. D has nothing to do with political appointments or
patronage. Prop. D will provide a better system to select the best
qualified person for an open position, following Civil Service
Rules. Other Bay Area cities don’t have patronage problems when
they choose from more than three qualified candidates. Why should
San Francisco?

Under Proposition D, Civil Service will continue to test appli-
cants and prepare eligible lists. Departments will hire qualified
applicants from these lists, following Civil Service Rules.
The only change made here is that we will eliminate wasteful
spending and broaden opportunities to hire the best individuals to
fill vital City jobs. Given that fact, why would anyone urge you to
maintain the status quo?

Why should San Francisco waste millions of dollars a year to
continue outdated personnel practices?

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
August 26, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan,
Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

For good government and a fair and efficient personnel system support Proposition D.

Susan Sutherland, President
San Francisco League of Women Voters

Proposition D is part of a civil service reform package of Charter amendments that deserve your Yes vote.

The Charter currently restricts the ability of department heads to fill a job vacancy with the best qualified applicant. Proposition D will allow the Civil Service Commission to give department heads greater discretion when choosing among job applicants. This will assure that our tax dollars are being spent on a qualified workforce that mirrors the diversity of San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

People who get the same scores on civil service tests ought to be treated the same way. Proposition D establishes that basic rule of fair play. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- WIDER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D and E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2

Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition D

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, relating to the certification of eligibles.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.329 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this Charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the Civil Service Commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of all those persons meeting the certification rule established for that classification. The Civil Service Commission shall establish certification rules. Certification rules shall not be more restrictive than the certification of all candidates receiving the three highest scores on the list of eligibles for such positions. Of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position: in case the position is promotional, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list; if there are fewer than three names on the list from which the certification is to be made there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.329 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment: In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex; provided however, the appointing officer shall give due consideration to applicable civil service equal employment opportunity (EEO) goals so as to maximize diversity at all levels of city employment. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall annually review each department's performance in meeting its civil service EEO obligations.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, relating to the removal or discharge of permanent employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.341 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.341 Dismissal for Cause Removal or Discharge of Permanent, Non-Probationary Employees

A. Any person employed under the civil service provisions of this charter, exclusive of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments as provided under Section 8.343 hereof, in a position defined by the commission as “permanent” may be removed or discharged by the appointing officer for just cause, upon written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and after an opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the appointing officer or his or her designee. Pending investigation of conduct involving such hearings, the appointing officer may suspend the person so accused if the accusation involves misappropriation of public funds or property, misuse or destruction of public property, drug addiction or habitual intemperance, mistreatment of persons, immorality, acts which would constitute a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, or acts which present an immediate danger to the public health and safety the appointing officer may place the accused person on unpaid administrative leave but such suspension shall not be void for no more than 30 days unless hearing upon the charges the investigation shall be delayed beyond such time by the act of the accused person. When charges are made the appointing officer imposes discharge or removal he or she shall, in writing, notify the person accused removed or discharged of the time and place where the charges will be heard; right to appeal the discharge or removal by mailing such statement to his last known address. The employee shall have thirty days from the date of mailing of the notice to file an appeal of the matter in writing with the appointing officer. Upon receipt of a timely appeal, the hearing appeal shall be conducted forthwith by a qualified and unbiased hearing officer who shall be employed under contract by the city and county and selected by procedures set forth in the rules of the civil service commission. The hearing officer shall publicly hear and determine the charges, appeal, and may approve the discharge or removal, or exonerate, or suspend or the accused.

If the employee is exonerated the hearing officer may, at his or her discretion, remit the full period of the suspension or any portion thereof and may order payment of salary to the employee for the prescribed period of time under suspension, the discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave, and the report of such period of suspension discharge or removal or unpaid administrative leave shall thereupon be expunged from the record of service of such employee.

The civil service commission shall immediately be notified of the charges when made, of the action of the appointing officer to remove or discharge, of the hearing appeal, and of the finding thereon. The finding of the hearing officer shall be final.

The civil service commission may remove or discharge an employee hear and determine for any charge filed by a citizen or by any member of or authorized agent of the commission when the appointing officer neglects or refuses to take such action bring such charge against the employee within 30 days of notification to the department head of the occurrence or event giving rise to the charge. Removal or discharge may be made for any cause upon after the employee is provided with written notice of the charges, copies of all documentation upon which the charges are based and after the employee has had the opportunity to be heard in his own defense respond to the charges before the civil service commission or its designee. The decision of the civil service commission shall be final.

Nothing in this section shall limit or restrict rules adopted by the commission governing dismissal of probationary employees, lay-offs or reduction in force or providing for the removal of any appointee who has abandoned his or her position as defined by civil service commission rule.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a recognized employee organization and any affected city department may agree to alternative procedures, including final and binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator jointly selected by the employee organization and the city, to deal with charges brought against individual employees, the resolution of such charges and the appropriate discipline, if any, to be imposed on the employee. Said alternative procedures shall be included in a Memorandum of Understanding between the city and the employee organization which shall be effective when ratified by the board of supervisors.

C. The effectiveness of this charter amendment is contingent upon the voters’ approval at the November 5, 1991 election of an amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter. If the amendment adding Section 8.409 to this charter is not adopted at the November 5, 1991 election, then it is the voters intent that (1) this amendment shall have no force and effect, (2) this amendment shall not become part of the charter, and (3) Section 8.341 shall continue to read as it did immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.

D. Subject to the contingency set forth in Section C above, this charter amendment shall be effective September 1, 1992. Prior to that date, Section 8.341 of this charter shall continue to read as it had immediately before the November 5, 1991 election.
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

PROPOSITION E

Shall City departments be allowed to terminate employees subject to appeal to an outside hearing officer, and shall the City be allowed to agree to alternative procedures for terminating employees, including binding arbitration?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City department may fire a permanent employee only after a series of steps. The final step is an appeal to an outside hearing officer. The City may only fire the employee if the hearing officer decides that the department has good reasons for the firing. Generally, the employee remains on the job and the payroll until the hearing officer makes a decision. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee cannot be fired.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment that would allow City departments to fire permanent employees and remove them from the payroll. The employee could then appeal the firing to an outside hearing officer. If the hearing officer rules against the department, the employee would be returned to work. The hearing officer also could give the employee back pay.

Proposition E also would allow a City department and an employee organization to agree to other procedures for firing employees, including binding arbitration. The Board of Supervisors would have to approve these agreements.

Proposition E would go into effect only if the voters also approve Proposition B, the Collective Bargaining charter amendment.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the way permanent City employees are fired.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to change the way permanent City employees are fired.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application it could accelerate the removal/discharge process for City employees and thereby affect the cost of government in an amount presently indeterminable.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Tom Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 54.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is the last part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package and is estimated to save the taxpayers several millions of dollars a year in unnecessary City costs.

Proposition E will allow the City to remove a fired employee from the payroll after a due process hearing. This is the same procedure used in the private sector and in other public agencies. Currently, an employee fired after a due process hearing remains on the payroll until a second hearing occurs. A hearing officer reviews the firing and then makes a final decision.

LESS THAN 3% OF FIRINGS HAVE BEEN REVERSED ON APPEAL. Yet employees now stay on the payroll, sometimes for months after being fired. Some for over a year. Some then retire with a disability.

Not only is this an unnecessary cost, but the department is delayed in filling these positions so that vital services can be provided to taxpayers.

Under Proposition E, a fired employee still has the right to appeal to a hearing officer. If the hearing officer decides the firing was unjust, the employee will be reinstated with back pay. If the employee is represented by a union, binding arbitration may be substituted for a hearing officer.

Proposition E provides equity as well as needed fiscal reform in these economically troubled times.

In order for Proposition E to take effect, Proposition B, the collective bargaining reform measure appearing on your ballot, must also be approved by the voters.

Your Yes vote on Proposition E will allow the City to begin the long-overdue modernization needed for our Civil Service operations.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Hsieh, Mather, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The current 30-day firing rule is a progressive rule that could well be adopted by industry and other public agencies.

The Charter allows managers to remove incompetent employees from the City payroll for the entire 30 days leading up to the employee actually being fired. If incompetent employees are permitted to stay on the payroll, City management has no one to blame but themselves.

The way the current system works is that the longest an employee can stay on the city payroll after being formally charged is 30 days.

The Charter mandates that charges be brought and the firing settled within that time frame.

Under other grievance systems firings can, and do, take months to go through this process — and after the typical long delays and uncertainties, no one is pleased with the results.

Keep the progressive 30-day rule.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Citizens Against Political Patronage
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The present system for firing City employees was adopted by the electorate to provide fair, swift dismissal hearings. Under this system, employees who are about to be fired are suspended without pay for 30-days pending a hearing. Hearing officers then consider the facts and make a ruling before the 30 days run out.

Proposition E opens the process to long delays with the net result being uncertainty, lost time, money and inefficiency for both employees and the City. Firing could take up to a year or more, instead of 30 days. Justice delayed is justice denied, for all the parties.

Vote against long delays. Don’t create more costs for the City. For workplace justice and municipal efficiency, keep the 30-day rule. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Citizens Against Political Patronage

REBUTTAL TO OPPOONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, part of the Civil Service Fiscal Reform Package, is designed to modernize the current firing procedures used by Civil Service and save taxpayers money in the process.

The current system allows City employees to remain on the payroll for months — in some cases more than a year after they have been fired. They then remain on the payroll until a second hearing before a hearing officer occurs.

Now, only employees who have committed crimes or are a threat to public safety can be suspended without pay after they are fired. This is less than 10% of the firings.

Since less than 3% of all firings are reversed on appeal, our present system is wasting taxpayers money. Let’s modernize our procedures and save money that could be much better spent.

Proposition E will not delay the process, it will improve it.

Since Proposition E will save money, modernize the system, and allow San Francisco to use the standard firing procedures used by the private sector and most other public jurisdictions, why would anyone suggest maintaining the status quo? Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Discharge of Civil Service Employees

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E protects an employee’s right to a hearing while giving the department head the ability to place an employee on unpaid leave. Because most dismissals are upheld by hearing officers, Proposition E will both improve productivity and save money. Should a dismissal not be upheld, the employee would receive back-pay.

Proposition E is fair to city managers, employees and taxpayers. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Even as employees are fired for such serious offenses as sex harassment, discrimination, or theft, our out-of-date rules require us to continue to pay their salaries through several appeals — sometimes a year long. We can’t hire good people to replace the bad, and city services suffer. This measure allows us to stop paying them after the first appeal, which is the same as in most workplaces. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS URGENTLY NEEDED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

PROPOSITIONS C, D AND E WILL PROVIDE SAN FRANCISCO WITH A FAIR AND MODERATE CIVIL SERVICE FISCAL REFORM PROGRAM THAT OFFERS:

- ESTIMATED SAVING OF $20 MILLION TO $30 MILLION PER YEAR
- MORE EFFICIENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
- WIDER JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY WORKERS
- FEWER TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
- MORE JOBS FILLED ON A PERMANENT BASIS

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR PROPOSITIONS C, D and E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Service Employees International Union Joint Council #2
Civil Service Commission
Grant Mickins, President
A. Lee Munson, Immediate Past President
Cleo Donovan, Vice President
Juan Rios, Commissioner
Emi R. Uyehara, Commissioner
Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party
L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Republican County Central Committee
Sam T. Harper, Immediate Past Chair, Republican County Central Committee
San Francisco Democratic Party

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition E

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed, when requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary for up to 180 days while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances, if certain conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City employees are military reservists. State law requires the City to pay such employees their full salary for their first 30 days on active duty — except for drills and training. After those 30 days, the City is not allowed to pay employees on active military duty.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow the Board of Supervisors, if requested by the Mayor, to pay City employees the difference between their City salary and their military salary, while they are on active duty under extraordinary circumstances. Employees would receive this benefit only if they are called to active duty for more than 30 days. These additional payments would be limited to 180 days. Payments required under state law would be subtracted from this benefit. Employees released from active duty must return to work for the City within 60 days; otherwise, the benefit would be considered a loan to the employee.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to provide this benefit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to provide this benefit.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. The increase in cost would depend upon the number of employees called to service, the duration of their absence and the differential between their City salary and military pay entitlement.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Last fall 37 employees of the city and county of San Francisco responded to our nation’s call and suddenly found themselves in great danger far from home, family and friends. Many of these men and women were the sole or principal breadwinners in their households. Unfortunately, their bills, debts, rent and mortgages did not cease with their call-up.

In many cases their income dropped by more than 50%!

Many private companies attempted to reduce this hardship by partially or fully compensating their employees for the difference between their military pay and their previous civilian pay for up to six months.

Prop. F does not require the city and county of San Francisco to spend any money! All Prop. F does is to allow the city to consider helping prevent our employees from a devastating financial situation at the very time that they are serving our nation.

One of the most heartening things to come out of Operation Desert Storm was that both those who were for the war, and those who were against it, supported our troops.

While Prop. F sadly is not retroactive and cannot help those Persian Gulf War veterans, it will allow us to assist our men and women in uniform should the need arise again.

Please join us in voting YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Working people do not declare war. Most people sent to war are working people. Their families deserve to be taken care of, not left to face economic hardship. This measure gives city workers protection against paycheck gaps caused by military call-ups. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, relating to providing workers salary continuation benefits. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.400 thereof, to add subdivision (i) at the end to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.
Section 8.400

(i) Notwithstanding any other limitation in the Charter to the contrary, and subject to meet and confer obligations of state law, the Mayor may request that the Board of Supervisors enact, and the Board shall then have the power to so enact, an ordinance entitled City officers or employees called to active duty with a United States military reserve organization to receive from the City the following as part of the individual’s compensation: for a period to be specified in the ordinance which may not exceed 180 days, the difference between the amount of the individual’s military pay and the amount the individual would have received as a City officer or employee had the employee worked his or her normal work schedule, including any merit raises which otherwise would have been granted during the time the individual was on active duty. Any such ordinance shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

1. The individual must have been called into active service for a period greater than 30 consecutive days.
2. The purpose for such call to active service shall be extraordinary circumstances and shall not include scheduled training, drills, unit training assemblies, or similar events.
3. The amounts authorized pursuant to such an ordinance shall be offset by amounts required to be paid pursuant to any other law in order that there be no double payments.

4. Any individual receiving compensation pursuant to such an ordinance shall execute an agreement providing that if such individual does not return to City service within 60 days of release from active duty, or if the individual is not fit for employment at that time, within 60 days of return to fitness for employment, then that compensation shall be treated as a loan payable with interest at a rate equal to the greater of (i) the rate received for the concurrent period by the Treasurer’s Pooled Cash Account or (ii) the minimum amount necessary to avoid imputed income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and any successor statute. Such loan shall be payable in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed 5 years, commencing 90 days after the individual’s release from active service or return to fitness for employment, as the case may be.
5. Such an ordinance shall not apply to any active duty served voluntarily after the time that the individual is called to active service.
6. Such ordinance shall not be retroactive.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, relating to the reclassification and status of housing police officers. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.530-3 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

Section 3.530-3 Transfer of Housing Authority Police to the City and County.

The board of supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall have and is hereby granted power to enter into any agreement with the State of California, or any officer, agency or commission of the State of California, and to pass all necessary legislation and to do or perform any other act or acts deemed necessary to effect the transfer of the employment, jurisdiction and control of the Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority to the city and county. The board of supervisors shall make every reasonable effort to consummate such an agreement no later than July 1, 1984.

Pursuant to said agreement, the city and county shall accept the transfer of all Housing Police Officers of the San Francisco Housing Authority from said Authority. All said Housing Police officers who are transferred to the city and county shall become employees of the City and County of San Francisco under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Police Department.

As of January 1, 1992, Housing Police Officers shall be granted status to the classification of Q2 Police Officers, provided that the individuals comply with each of the state mandated requirements for full peace officer status, and each of the City’s requirements for appointment to the Q2 classification.

Employees granted Q2 Police Officer status under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions of employment as police officers of the City and County of San Francisco, except that said employees shall be entitled to remain members of the Public Employees’ Retirement System of the State of California subject to the approval of the Public Employees’ Retirement System to retain said employees. If the City is unable to obtain the agreement of the Public Employees’ Retirement System to retain those employees who were Housing Police Officers on January 1, 1992, then said employees will be individually offered the choice of Q2 status and pension benefits under Charter section 8.586 as of January 1, 1992 or retention of their current status in all respects.
PROPOSITION G

Shall Housing Authority police officers be allowed to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements?  


Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1983, Housing Authority police officers were transferred from the Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. Because they were not classified as San Francisco police officers, they do not have the same collective bargaining rights. They continue to belong to the State Public Employees' Retirement System instead of the City's retirement system. There are 14 Housing Authority police officers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements. They would work under the same terms and conditions as other San Francisco police officers. They could remain in the state Public Employees' Retirement System if the state approves. If not, each Housing Authority police officer would choose between becoming a San Francisco police officer and joining the City's retirement system, or continuing as a Housing Authority police officer and staying in the state Public Employees' Retirement System.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco police officers if they meet state and City requirements.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow Housing Authority police officers to become San Francisco Police Officers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted it would allow certain Housing Authority police to gain status as sworn Police Officers. If these officers remain in their existing retirement system, there should be no effect on the cost of government. However, if the officers are enrolled in the regular police retirement plan, there could be an increase in the cost of government, based on current salary and fringe benefit levels, of approximately $20,000 per officer per year.

In my opinion, the maximum annual cost, should all current Housing Authority Officers transition to sworn Police Officers and transfer to the higher retirement cost plan, would be approximately $200,000 per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On July 24, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 62.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Board of Supervisors unanimously supports Proposition G as an equity measure at no significant long-term cost to reclassify no more than twelve former city employees in the official classification of Housing Police Officers to the classification of Q2 Police Officers. The charter amendment corrects a situation which has existed since 1982, when Housing Police officers were transferred from the San Francisco Housing Authority to the San Francisco Police Department. It is recognized that the employees remaining in the former classification are performing substantially similar duties to those performed by San Francisco Police Officers, and if otherwise qualified, they will be granted status to the Police Officer classification as of January 1, 1992. This Charter Amendment is supported by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Police Commission and the Civil Service Commission.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

What the argument put forth by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors fails to mention is the cost of Proposition G to the taxpayers of San Francisco. While the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, Harvey Rose, the respected Budget Analyst for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, whose financial audits have saved San Francisco taxpayers countless millions over the years, states that Proposition G could result in yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262.

Is this expense reasonable just to reclassify Housing Authority police officers who may or may not opt to join the plan? Definitely not. Housing Authority police officers are currently in the state Public Employees Retirement System. This is one of the best retirement systems in the country. There is absolutely no need to reclassify Housing Authority police officers. This measure is imprudent and unnecessary. The San Francisco Taxpayers Association urges you to vote "NO" on Proposition G.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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

We urge a vote against Proposition G, simply because City taxpayers cannot afford it. Although the Controller states that the cost of Proposition G is approximately $200,000 per year, the respected Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, found that it could result in additional yearly costs of $374,863 to $451,262 to City taxpayers.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G contains no provisions which impose additional costs to the City. Housing Police Officers are paid at the same rate of pay as Q2 Police Officers. Proposition G would merely change their classification to Q2 Police Officers as an equity measure. Housing Police Officers have always been members of the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and will remain in PERS as long as PERS approves. Should PERS not approve the retention of said employees in PERS, each employee will have two options: retain their Housing Police Officer classification and remain in PERS; or to be reclassified as a Q2 Police Officer and join the San Francisco Retirement System. PERS Board members have stated that they would move to approve maintaining the officers in the PERS system as Q2's upon passage of the Charter amendment, thus resulting in no cost being imposed on the City.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Britt.

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

We, the eleven Housing Police officers affected by Proposition G, tried everything possible to keep the charter amendment a no cost measure.

We informed all City representatives that we intend to remain in the Public Employees' Retirement System and offered to sign any document that would make that binding.

The original draft of this amendment provided language that kept this a no cost measure; but the city attorney insisted on the permissive language which resulted in the possible costs reported in the controller's statement.

We hope you understand our dilemma and ask for your support. Please vote yes on Proposition G.

Thank you.

Marco DesAngles, Mission Station
Mike Phelan, Mission Station
Carroll Henry, Northern Station
Lou Vance, Northern Station
John Bain, Potrero Station
Arthur Hernandez, Potrero Station
Harvey Josua, Potrero Station
Steve Murphy, Potrero Station
Jamie Ongpin, Potrero Station
Melvin Thornton, Potrero Station
Charles Wilkerson, Potrero Station

These men and women have a tough job and they do it well. They are a big part of our success in restoring the Housing Authority. The risks they take are the same as other police officers, and they ought to be treated equally. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
Deputy Mayor Ban

PROPOSITION H
Shall the City be prohibited from employing on behalf of the Mayor any employee, including a deputy to the Mayor, whose duties include supervising any City department, and shall compensation of Mayor's Office employees be limited to 70% of the Mayor's compensation? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Charter makes the Mayor responsible for supervising all departments managed by boards and commissions. The Mayor may hire employees to help carry out this responsibility. Mayors have given their employees various titles, including "Deputy Mayor." Salaries for City employees, including employees in the Mayor's Office, are set by surveying salaries paid by public and private employers in the Bay Area for similar work.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would prohibit the Mayor from assigning a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Proposition H also would prohibit the City from employing for the Mayor a deputy to the Mayor or any other employee, regardless of title, to supervise the administration of any City department. Under Proposition H, no employee of the Mayor's Office could be paid more than 70% of the Mayor's salary.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed amendment be approved, in my opinion, based on the 1991-92 budget for the Office of the Mayor, a reduction of approximately $28,000 in salary costs could occur.

How "H" Got on the Ballot
On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition H to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 46,720 of the signatures submitted were valid, 6,005 more than the required number of signatures.
H
Deputy Mayor Ban

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Keep Government Clean Committee recommends a “Yes” vote on Proposition H because bloated city government is one of the major symptoms of our city’s financial woes. Proposition H gives San Franciscans the opportunity to ban the contrived position of Deputy Mayor once and for all.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION H

The Agnos administration established seven Deputy Mayors with salaries as high as $103,000 per year. Proposition H would prohibit the Mayor from assigning an employee, regardless of title, to supervise any city department already under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer, another elected official and/or boards or commissions.

San Francisco doesn’t need highly paid bureaucrats overseeing other bureaucrats whose Charter-given responsibility is to manage city departments. The City Charter clearly states the positions the Mayor can appoint. It says nothing about the appointment of “Deputy Mayors.” Yet, the incumbent has simply added bureaucrats and bestowed upon them the sham title of “Deputy Mayor.”

According to an April, 1990 analysis by Board of Supervisor Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, the annual cost of the Mayor’s office increased $963,477 because of these added expenditures on salaries, pension benefit contributions, health insurance premiums and the like during just the first year of the Agnos administration; that’s money which could’ve been spent on libraries, medical clinics and police and fire protection.

Let’s put an end to this wasteful arrogance once and for all. Vote “YES” on H!

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As the independent City Controller has stated, Proposition H only affects three people. It vindictively cuts their salaries approximately $9,000 each. Who are we talking about?

- The City’s Director of Finance, who voluntarily gave up a ten year appointment and took a $22,000 pay cut to direct the City’s budget team during a difficult year. He was recognized for “Excellence in Fiscal Management” and San Francisco was named among “The Top 15 Cities in America” in Finance World’s 1991 edition.

- Independent Budget Analyst, Harvey Rose, in a August 13, 1991 report states: “The City and County of San Francisco, which has the most complex budget of any county surveyed, has the lowest number of centralized budget staff devoted to the analysis and preparation of the budget.”

- San Francisco’s first African American Deputy Mayor, a second generation native San Franciscan who this year voted “Man of the Year” by San Francisco Business and Professional Women, Inc.

- San Francisco’s first Asian American Director of the Office of Business and Economic Development. He left a job as a Strategic Planner for the Bank of America to serve the City. He successfully won an Enterprise Zone designation from the State, which helps over one third of San Francisco’s businesses.

His leadership in recruiting Pacific Rim business for San Francisco was instrumental in Sister Cities International recognizing San Francisco for “Best Performance of any U.S. City” in 1991.

Proposition H does little to reduce the cost of city government. Please vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

This year as part of city budget reductions, I reduced the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three. That saved $268,000. Because of this change, the City Controller’s official estimate is that Proposition H will only save $28,000. It does so in a punitive manner by cutting the salaries of the city’s first African American deputy mayor, first Asian American to direct our city’s business office, and most unfairly, cuts the salary of the Director of Finance who volunteered to move from the Controller’s job paying 30% more.

The supporters of Proposition H have spent more than twice as much money to qualify the measure as it will save.

Every modern Mayor in our city has employed the positions of Deputy Mayor. It signifies an important member of the Mayor’s staff who represents him or her throughout the city and elsewhere.

My political opponents should direct their attacks at me, and settle them honorably in the campaign for Mayor, not by rewriting the City Charter. Please join San Francisco Tomorrow and the Democratic Central Committee in opposing Proposition H.

Mayor Art Agnos

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

The Keep Government Clean Committee thanks countless citizens who devoted time and effort to collecting signatures to ensure Proposition H’s success particularly Frank Jordan and his campaign volunteers who spent weekend after weekend securing voters’ signatures. Their altruistic dedication reflects an abiding desire to keep City Hall honest.

The Mayor’s protestations about reducing the number of Deputy Mayors from seven to three don’t ring true. Neither does his arithmetic. In the first year alone of his seven Deputy Mayors, the cost to taxpayers was over $900,000. Mayor Agnos claims he saved $268,000 by cutting Deputy Mayors from seven to three, and that the Controller estimates Proposition H saves $28,000. But subtracting $268,000 from over $900,000 results in a $632,000 saving from H! During the past 4 years, Agnos’ “Deputy Mayor” system has cost taxpayers over $4,000,000. Appointed by the Mayor but a few months ago, the “controlled” Controller forgets that Deputy Mayor titles have merely been altered; such bureaucrats remain, at virtually the same salaries and benefits. The Mayor’s “controlled” Controller ignores elimination of positions involving another layer of bureaucracy over Charter-authorized department heads.

The best modern Mayor in our City, George Christopher, never employed a “Deputy Mayor.” He followed the Charter, with an appropriate staff which represented him throughout the City, nobly and effectively. “Deputy Mayors,” unlike department heads, have no Charter authority! They’re not accountable for budgets; they have no lawful power over departmental matters. They’re simply overpaid political operatives, whom we can’t afford.

Keep Government Clean Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Enough.

At a time when our libraries, swimming pools, and bus routes are being cut back, the Mayor quietly is hiring more and more high-paid political assistants.

Passing this measure is an important step in fighting back.

James Fang, BART Director
Michael Bernick, BART Director

After we began circulating petitions for voters’ signatures, Mayor Agnos made cosmetic changes in his seven “Deputy Mayor” positions. While only one “Deputy Mayor” now carries the title, two former “Deputy Mayors” have kept their same salaries, and the others are still around but have been moved and awarded new titles. Elimination of these positions will save approximately $1,000,000 per year. The Mayor will not go without help; in his budget there are 40 positions called ”Assistants to the Mayor,” earning from $36,452 to $86,684. There are an additional 81 positions in the Mayor’s budget, not affected by Proposition H.

When Agnos became Mayor in January, 1987, there were 102 positions in the Mayor’s Office at a cost of approximately $3,800,000. Now his office costs approximately $6,100,000 and is staffed by 124 people!

Discounting positions in the Mayor’s Office funded from state and federal sources, there were 82 exclusively city-funded positions in the Mayor’s Office in 1990, while there were just 21 in San Jose, a larger city. How would you like to be a city department head, accountable under the Charter to a Commission or to the Chief Administrative Officer, but having to answer also to an illegitimate “Deputy Mayor” or some similarly titled person? Can you imagine the state of your morale?

Don’t be fooled by the “Agnos shuffle.” Vote “YES” on H.

Cheryl Arenson
Dorothy M. Patridge
Martha E. Nilan

FOR THE COST OF THESE POLITICAL CRONIES, THINK WHAT WE COULD PROVIDE FOR STUDENTS, LIBRARIES, AND HEALTH CARE. SHAME ON AGNOS!

Rich Bodisco, Chair
S.F. For Reasonable Reform
Rick Fenton, A Concerned Citizen

This caps the fat salaries paid to the mayor’s political associates. These patronage jobs violate the public trust.

The mayor could use the same money to hire a dozen physicians to staff my HIV Early Intervention Centers proposal, and care for 10,000 HIV patients. Or staff our neighborhood libraries, keep our streets clean, or (fill-in the blank).

As San Francisco’s next mayor, I will clean house and end the big-salary giveaway.

Richard D. Hongisto, Mayoral Candidate

There exists in City Hall a pernicious practice by the Mayor of designating certain extravagantly paid personnel as Deputy Mayors. The City Charter contains no legitimate authorization for any such position, but the Mayor established seven so-called Deputy Mayors, drawing salaries as high as $103,000 per year. With health and other benefits and assistants, there’s been a cost to taxpayers of over $1,000,000 annually. That doesn’t include overhead. The Grand Jury last year denounced Mayor Agnos’ practice and called his office “over-staffed given the population and budget of the city.” Its report found that “six of the Deputy Mayors are paid $94,458,” one other Deputy Mayor “is paid . . . $102,500,” “the Civil Service Commission has not received information detailing the duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Mayors (nor of the 45 Assistants to the Mayor);” and that the Deputy Mayors “are not held accountable for specific operational areas of responsibility . . . yet their salaries exceed those of some of the department heads who oversee and are accountable for large budgets and departments;” The Grand Jury additionally discovered: “ . . . the San Francisco Mayor’s Office, when compared to Mayor’s offices in other combined governments . . . has the largest budget, the largest number of employees and pay the highest top salary.” Moreover, the Grand Jury certified that “witnesses cited occasions when a Deputy Mayor has put the need to enhance or protect the political image of the Mayor above the needs of the city.”

The Mayor has 124 people under his thumb and “Deputy Mayors” duplicate already authorized positions. They’re wasteful. The city’s limited funds must be used for health, police, fire and other services to San Francisco, not for political patronage. Vote YES on H.

Thomas G. Dempsey
John Riordan
Albert L. Powers

Martha M. Gillham
Daniel G. Gillham
Dorothy L. Powers

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

When the then incumbent left the Mayor’s office in 1975 there were 57 people working there. Back then it cost $1,600,000 to run the Mayor’s office. Today under Art Agnos there are 124 people in the Mayor’s office at a cost to taxpayers of over $6,000,000. Why should there be twice as many people in Room 200 today as there were 16 years ago? And why should the Mayor’s office, factoring in inflation, cost over twice as much to run as it did 16 years ago? It shouldn’t and that’s why a citizen initiative to ban Deputy Mayors collected over 57,000 signatures to put it on the ballot.

Some will argue that because more state and federal money is used to pay for the cost of the Mayor’s office that everything is “ok”, but that’s malarkey as a look at your pay stub shows. Whatever the source the taxpayer is still stuck with a fat bill. What is the City receiving for these $100,000 Deputy Mayors? Not much. According to the Grand Jury Report they do political things for Art Agnos. So, let’s restore some common sense to City Hall by banning Deputy Mayors.

VOTE “YES” ON “H”.

Marian F. Corbett
Dan Dunnigan
Abbie F. Airo

Corrinne Arenson
Clifford J. D’Urso
Barbara M. Zerhusen

In January 1990 I initiated a formal review of Mayor Agnos’ deputy mayor system. Since then, our Budget Analyst and Civil Grand Jury have found that the deputy mayor system is a bloated, inefficient way of doing business.

I urge you to vote for Proposition H so we can restore accountability to the Mayor’s office. Fancy titles and huge salaries only create the illusion of leadership. San Franciscans deserve better than that!

Vote yes on Proposition H!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The purpose of Proposition H is to end the sorry spectacle of the creation by ANY MAYOR of bureaucrats with fancy titles, such as “Deputy Mayor.” The best Mayor in modern San Francisco history, George Christopher, never had a Deputy Mayor. He obeyed the Charter, appointing people only to those positions authorized by it. In the Alioto administration, one person arrogated to himself the title of “Deputy Mayor”. People laughed about it on the then Board of Supervisors, never thinking it was a serious effort to destroy the Charter or cost taxpayers unjustified money, particularly because that individual occupied the Charter-authorized position of “Executive Deputy”. Thereafter, however, the illegitimate practice increased through the next two administrations, reaching a climax with the current mayor, who within a year of taking office, created seven (7) “Deputy Mayor” positions, with ultimate salaries of over $100,000 plus fringe benefits and immense associated additional costs to taxpayers. Sensing that this voter initiative would qualify for the ballot, this Mayor now tries to distract voters by claiming abolition of the positions. While the titles have been changed, the employees remain, at virtually the same salaries and auxiliary costs. As shown by the Budget Analyst’s review of the current City budget, the seven “Deputy Mayors” have been hidden under different names in City Hall crevices. Proposition H uproots and disposes of them, at a resultant savings of approximately $1,000,000 per year to taxpayers. Don’t be fooled by the “shell game”; vote YES on H.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quenin L. Kopp

The Agnos system of seven deputy mayors — now with new titles, but still averaging nearly $100,000 a year — is a waste of your money.

An effective mayor controls the heads of each department, so why should the mayor need expensive deputy mayors to manage his own department heads?

There will be only one chief of staff in an Alioto administration. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!
We believe that the Mayor is elected to manage and staff the Mayor's office as he or she sees fit. The Mayor needs management flexibility to solve the City’s complex problems. If we do not like the way the City is run, we must elect new officials, not tie the hands of government.

Vote NO on Proposition H!
Andy Nash
Peter Moylan
Charlene Clarke
Norm Rolfe
Bernie Choden
Jack Morrison
San Francisco Tomorrow

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION H

BAN DEPUTY MAYORS
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER SECTION 3.100 BY ADDING NEW SECTIONS 3.100-3 BANNING APPOINTMENTS TO THE POSITION OF DEPUTY TO THE MAYOR OR TO POSITIONS KNOWN AS DEPUTY MAYOR.

NOTE: This entire section is new.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:
San Francisco Charter Section 3.100 is amended and modified by adding Section 3.100-3 reading as follows:
Section 3.100-3 Prohibiting Deputy Mayors.
Notwithstanding any other provisions or limitations of this charter to the contrary, the mayor may not designate nor may the city and county employ on the mayor's behalf any person to act as deputy to the mayor or any similar employment classification, regardless of title, whose responsibilities include but are not necessarily limited to supervision of the administration of any department for which the chief administrative officer, an elected official other than the mayor or an appointed board or commission is assigned responsibility elsewhere in this charter; nor may any employee in the office of the mayor be compensated at a level in excess of seventy percent of the compensation paid to the mayor under the salary standardization provisions of this charter.

This section shall take effect on the first day of January of the year following its approval by the voters of the city and county.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Appointment of Minors to Boards

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Charter be amended to allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments?

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City wants to include people under 18 on certain boards, commissions and advisory bodies. At this time, you must be a San Francisco resident and an elector to be appointed to any of these groups. To be an elector, you must be at least 18 years old and eligible to register to vote.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow San Francisco residents under 18 to be appointed to a board, commission or advisory body if the law creating that body provides for such appointments. Persons under 18 when appointed would be required to become electors when they reached 18.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow persons under 18 to be appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body when the law creating that body provides for such appointments.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the requirement that persons appointed to a City board, commission or advisory body be 18 or older.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On July 22, 1991, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This Charter Amendment would allow young people under 18 to serve on boards, commissions and advisory bodies when the Board of Supervisors has specifically provided for their participation. Currently San Francisco youth under 18 are excluded from participating on the advisory boards and commissions which forge policies for our youth in San Francisco.

The Delinquency Prevention Commission, for example, currently provides two seats for youth under 18. These seats are unfulfilled because of the Charter requirement that members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies must be electors.

In order for the City to address the changing needs and realities of young people, it is important that San Francisco amend its policy and adopt a system in which the voices of young people are an integral part of decisions which affect their lives and future. Surely there is no more effective voice for the youth than youth.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The argument of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor for this measure cleverly ignores the point: they ask us to amend our Charter to create a fiction, namely, that people under 18 are electors, when they legally are not. They do so under the guise of eligibility for membership on a board or commission. It used to be that you had to be a voter to participate in policy decisions of boards or commissions of city government. In fact, it still is. That's what the Charter requires and for good reason. Commissioners are accountable; they exercise legal responsibility. That's why the law requires them to be electors. Proposition I resembles that line in "Alice in Wonderland" where Tweedledee explains to Alice: "if it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic."

We urge you to reject a legalistically contrived ballot measure by voting "NO" on Proposition I.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Appointment of Minors to Boards

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

While this proposal seems well intentioned, it is nonsensical public policy to treat minors as electors (when they are not) so as to serve as city commissioners.

There surely are enough well qualified electors who are willing and able to serve on city boards and commissions without drafting minors to do so. While we wholeheartedly support the concept of encouraging teenagers to be involved in governmental issues, it is a fiction to call them electors so they can be given the awesome responsibility of a commissioner. We should listen to their thoughts and ideas, but people under 18 should not be placed in a contrived position as electors to formulate public policy. Common sense urges that you vote NO on Proposition I.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The issue raised by Proposition I is not the availability of qualified electors but fairness in government. Proposition I does not declare teenagers to be electors. Rather, it provides that on certain governmental bodies young people should have a voice. The only body presently so constituted is the Delinquency Prevention Commission.

Placing young people in positions of leadership is not contrived. It is a respectful and practical approach to public policy and a recognition that age and wisdom are not mutually exclusive.

This legislation would have no application to the powerful boards and commissions created under the Charter. It would only apply to governmental bodies created by the Board of Supervisors where participation by persons under 18 is expressly deemed helpful to the City as well as to its young people.

This is a good government issue.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Our youth have the intelligence and ability to help shape public policy on the issues that affect their lives. Boards and commissions that determine how the City reaches out to help our youth must have input from the youth themselves in order to have any chance of success.

Join me in voting YES on Proposition I.

*Supervisor Angela Alioto*

Voices of young people should be heard in City Hall. Too often adults do all of the talking and none of the listening. This measure allows young people to be appointed to those positions that have been designated for them — but which can't be filled now because of a Catch-22 in the Charter. This fixes that. Vote "yes".

*Mayor Art Agnos*

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof, providing that minors may be appointed by the board of supervisors to boards, commissions or advisory bodies created by legislation of the board of supervisors if the legislation allows the appointment of minors to the board, commission or advisory body.

The Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 5, 1991 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 8.100 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county and an elector thereof immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, if a board, commission or advisory body is established by a legislative act which provides that any member or members of the board, commission or advisory body may be under the age of 18 years, then appointees to serve on the board, commission or advisory body in positions in which the original legislative act allows persons under the age of 18 to serve shall be residents, but need not be electors until they have attained the age of 18. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.
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PROPOSITION J

Shall the City be required to create a Children's Fund, to be used only for certain additional services for children, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that Fund annually for ten years, and shall the City be required to prepare an annual Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for services for children is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on services for children.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment. For 10 years, the City would be required to place a certain part of its property tax revenues in a Children's Fund. This Fund would pay for additional services for children under 18. In the first year, the amount would be 1-1/4 cents for each $100 of assessed property value; for the next 9 years the portion would be 2-1/2 cents.

The Fund could only be spent on children's services as follows: child care, job readiness, training and placement programs, social services (including prenatal services to pregnant adult women), educational programs, recreation, delinquency prevention and library services. For the first 4 years, at least 25% of the Fund would be used for childcare, at least 25% for job training and placement, and at least 25% for health and social services. Beginning with the fifth year, the Board of Supervisors could change or eliminate these minimums.

The measure prohibits using the Fund for certain purposes, including services which benefit children only indirectly. The City would be prohibited from reducing spending for children's services below what it spent in 1990-91 or 1991-92, whichever is higher. Money in the Fund could be used only to increase spending for children's services.

Each year, after public hearings, the Mayor would send to the Board of Supervisors a Children's Services Plan setting goals for the Fund.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to place a certain amount of the City's property tax revenues in a Fund to provide additional services for children under 18.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this Fund.
Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand specific children's services as set forth in the measure, mandate the current level of spending on children's services with prescribed escalation factors, and require certain administrative tasks to be done by various boards, commissions and the Controller.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to children's programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures. In addition, since this initiative prohibits the use of these funds for the operations and maintenance of recreation & park, library and hospital facilities, even if used for expanded children's programs, supplementary general fund monies may be required to support these expanded programs.

Based on 1991-92 budgets and property tax assessments, approximately $5.7 million in 1992-93, $13.2 million in 1993-94, and $14.0 million in 1994-95, and increasing thereafter with the rate of increase in assessed values of city properties until 2001-2002, would be reallocated by this measure.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On August 1, 1991, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition J to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,715 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 51,140 of the signatures were valid, 10,425 more than the required number of signatures.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The condition of children in San Francisco — all children, of all colors and all economic classes — is deteriorating, sometimes to crisis proportions.

The crisis is inhumane and expensive. Lives are being destroyed. All our futures are in jeopardy, even though prevention is less costly and more effective than trying to repair broken lives.

Proposition J, The Children's Amendment, is the result of three year's work by 60 child-serving agencies, The Children's Budget Coalition — many of which are not funded in any way by city funds.

Year after year, Coalition members watched the children's percentage of the City budget decline. They concluded that:

Without special protections, children will continue to be victims in the annual budget wars conducted by adults.

Children can't vote, lobby or contribute to political campaigns. As a result their needs are often ignored.

Proposition J requires that special protections for children be written into the City Charter — as Child Labor laws have written special protections into state and federal law. It provides a minimum guarantee for funding for children's programs; a minimum guarantee for prevention and enrichment, rather than abuse, unemployment, prison and disease.

The Children's Fund, created by Proposition J, would only constitute approximately .5% (one half of one percent) of the total city budget.

Proposition J makes significant improvements without new taxes or bureaucracies, by re-ordering city priorities and coordinating services provided by a dozen city departments.

Because children are the next generation, Proposition J is a guarantee for the future of us all.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR CHILDREN. VOTE FOR THE FUTURE. VOTE FOR OURSELVES.

Margaret Brodkin, Director
Greg Day, President
Jean Jacobs, Founder
Coleman Advocates for Children

Yori Wada, Board of Regents, U.C.*
Michael Shaw, Black Leadership Forum

Art Tapia, Sergeant, SFPD*, Chair
Alicia Wang, Treasurer
Children's Amendment Campaign

* For identification only

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is not as simple or easy as its sponsors say. While not disputing the validity of their contentions about children's problems, other groups in San Francisco have major problems, including the elderly, the mentally ill, the physically disabled, the unemployed, the sick and infirm, Muni Railway riders, blighted neighborhoods. Proposition J is a flawed, simplistic way to address children's problems. It limits the discretion of elected representatives to expend General Fund revenues and affects seriously the city's ability to balance future budgets by reducing available tax dollars. Like to the Open Space Fund, it diverts property tax collections for one group at the expense of others. What group will be next to obtain the same diversion of property tax collections? Its robbing Peter to pay Paul. A pending state measure would provide substantial additional money for the General Fund and children's services, by conforming state tax codes to Proposition 13 requirements and reappraising large-corporation property in San Francisco upon changes in majority stock ownership. That creates more money for children's services in San Francisco, without taking money from police, fire, health, library or elderly services.

Finally, the money Proposition J diverts from property tax collections will soon be all that city government allocates to children's services. The "minimum guarantee" mentioned by the sponsors will become the maximum, like the lottery for education. That's human nature. I don't want the "floor" to be the "ceiling" and that's why I'm voting "NO" on "J".

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Proposition J is another seductive, but deleterious, concept, fostered specially for a particular segment of society. Who can argue against providing money for the needs of children? Obviously, we love our children and want to aid them as necessary. But, Proposition J is not the way to do it. It is a fiscal "gimmick", which takes two and one-half cents per $100 assessed property valuation and sequesters it in a special fund. It raises no extra money for children's services; it reduces the amount of money which might be needed more from time to time for the elderly, for hospital and library facilities and recreation and parks.

Already, San Francisco's budget has been adversely affected for nearly 17 years by diversion of property tax revenue to remove private property from the tax rolls for "open space". This measure includes escalation factors which would divert $13,200,000 from the General Fund by 1993, and thereafter divert an increasing sum at a rate of approximately 9% per year. Proposition J mandates services without providing a realistic method of paying. Earmarking a fixed percentage of the City budget for any purpose is terrible public policy. Meeting its requirements will inevitably cause cuts in other services like law enforcement and health care for the elderly. If this passes, effective governance by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors will become even more excruciatingly difficult. That's why I'm voting against Proposition J, even if other elected public officials in San Francisco won't admit they'd like to tell you to do so also. Vote "NO" on J.

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Protecting children is not a "gimmick." There is no gimmicky in being able to say "yes" to mothers needing childcare so they can return to work, or "yes" to teenagers needing special training to get jobs.

Opponents to J object to "diverting" a tiny percent of the city budget (.5%) to children. They want to continue the politics-as-usual budget process. That process has utterly failed children. Failed to provide even the most basic services — like immunizations from disease, safe afterschool programs, and adequate library books. Children cannot cut budget "deals" to get their fair share. They are the one group for whom special budget protections are essential.

Spending an additional one-half of 1% of the budget on children will not prevent San Francisco from meeting other critical needs. It saves money to invest in developing a law-abiding, healthy, qualified younger generation. How could proponents of greater efficiency in government argue that such efficiency is not possible when it comes to finding funds for our children?

The Children's Fund will only increase at the same rate as city revenues. The so-called "escalating factor" merely controls for inflation.

San Franciscans have understood the unique vulnerability of children. They have not been swayed by divisive rhetoric that pits one group against another. Read the arguments that follow. Seniors, police officers, law enforcement officials, gay and lesbian leaders, environmentalists and members of every neighborhood all agree: Protecting children is enlightened, farsighted public policy.

Yori Wada
Michael Shaw
Jean Jacobs
Art Tapia

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

It is undeniable that children’s services are underfunded. The ongoing financial cutbacks from the state and federal government threaten to aggravate the situation.

Because children cannot vote, the electorate must insulate children’s services from the political process. The Children’s Amendment will protect children’s programs and guarantee that children remain a top priority no matter who is in office.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Children deserve a special place in the city’s budget. Legally they can’t vote or speak for themselves. This measure gives them the claim on city funds that they need. I have analyzed our city funds and am confident we can deliver what Proposition J asked for without hurting other people. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mayor Art Agnos

In 1989, I introduced legislation to create a Children’s Budget for San Francisco, but the mayor refused to allocate the money. Now, the mayor is jumping on the bandwagon, but it is not enough to care about children only in an election year.

I have fought every year for budgeting that starts with the neediest: our children.

Twenty-three percent of our children under five live in poverty.

We need better health services for children, more day care options, job training and programs for abused children. These must be our top priority.

Vote YES on Proposition J.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

I am proud to have been the first public official to endorse the Children’s Amendment.

As former sheriff, I understand the need for prevention services to reach out to our young people. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors, it’s clear to me that children cannot compete with the special interests that dominate City budget debates.

Our children are shortchanged. Proposition J is a necessary framework to end this injustice, and care for our children. As a parent, as a children’s advocate, I respectfully urge your vote for Proposition J.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

In the politics-as-usual process of the San Francisco city budget, children are especially vulnerable. They are too small to hire lobbyists, make campaign contributions, and cut deals.

Now, San Francisco’s children are in the midst of a worsening crisis: child abuse in San Francisco is up 400% over the last ten years; there are 8,000 kids on the waiting list for child-care; 23% of all mothers in San Francisco have poor and inadequate pre-natal care.

We support Proposition J, to amend the San Francisco Charter to provide a minimum guarantee for funding children’s programs.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Evelyn Wilson, Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee
Jennifer Clary, Richmond District Democratic Club
Dorice Murphy, President, Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Joe O’Donoghue, President, SF Residential Builders Association
Sue Hestor
Carol Kocivar
Calvin Welch
Dennis Antenore
“Ramona” Albright, Twin Peaks Council & Open Space Conservancy*
Gene Coleman
“Irish” Pat Lawlor

* For identification purposes only

Proposition J is good government and sound fiscal policy. Proposition J does not raise taxes. It creates a Children’s Fund by utilizing existing resources. It requires the city to reallocate approximately one percent of the city’s General Fund, less than half of one percent of the overall city budget, to children’s services. This can be done without a reduction in other city services if the city government would allocate and expend funds with greater efficiency. The Children’s Amendment will be one more pressure point on the city to improve its financial management, and the children of the city will benefit.

Setting aside a portion of the budget to meet critical needs is standard budget practice. It is already done for the arts, for seniors and for open space purchases, to name a few. It certainly makes sense to provide a similar guarantee for our children.

Investing in children is the wisest investment the city can make, one of the best possible uses of public revenues.

Victor Honig, CPA
Roland Quan, CPA

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

SAN FRANCISCO’S CHILDREN FACE A SERIOUS CRISIS:

- Children on waiting list for day-care — 8,000
- Child Abuse — UP 400%, 1980 – 1990
- Children without health coverage — UP 300% 1985 – 1990
- Homeless children and youth — 5,000 each year
- Mothers without adequate pre-natal care — 23%
- High School dropouts — 1,500 per year

Proposition J, The Children’s Amendment, will continue existing programs, and, with no new taxes, provide enough money to:

- Provide childcare for 1,000 additional children;
- Establish mental health and family support centers to prevent child abuse;
- Provide pre-natal care for all expectant mothers currently without care;
- Bring library purchases of children’s books up to the same level as Oakland, and expand library hours for children;
- Provide jobs and job training for 1,500 youths;
- Provide after-school recreation programs, tutoring programs, AIDS prevention, school-based health-care and more.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Asian Childcare Coalition
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Ctr
Booker T. Washington Center
Camp Fire Boys/Girls
Catholic Charities, SF
Catholic Youth Organization
Central City Hospitality House
Children’s Council/Childcare Switchboard
Children’s Law Offices
Children Now
Children’s Self-Help Center
Coleman Advocates
Family School
Family Service Agency, SF
Gay/Lesbian Youth Advocates
Grandparents Who Care
Haight-Ashbury Play Program
Income Rights Project
Japanese Community Youth Council
Jewish Family/Children’s Services
La Casa de las Madres
Legal Services for Children
Maternal Child/Adolescent Health Board
Mission Reading Clinic
Morrisania West
Mothers/Fathers of Concern
Omega Boys Club
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
SF Association for Education of Young Children
SF Boys/Girls Club
SF Child Abuse Council
SF Headstart (Far West Laboratory)
SF Parents Lobby
SF PTA
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Visitation Valley Community Center
Visitation Valley Parents for Youth
Wu Yee Children’s Services
Young Community Developers
Youth Advocates/Huckleberry House
Youth Employment Coalition
Youth Law Center
YWCA

The best way to reduce crime is to prevent it. Taking care of our children is the smartest, most cost-effective way to keep our youth out of the criminal justice system. That’s why we as police officers urge you to vote yes on The Children’s Amendment.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Children's Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Every day, we deal with the tragic human and financial costs of failing to take preventative action to help the City's children live safe, honest and productive lives.

The City currently pays over $30,000 a year to keep a juvenile in a correctional facility — in addition to the cost to the public of his/her crimes or misdemeanors. It would cost only $2,800 a year to provide both job training and after school recreation.

The City currently pays $2,000 a day for neo-natal intensive care for crack babies. It would cost only $125 a day to provide a drug program for a pregnant teenager.

The City currently pays $15,000 a year to keep an abused or neglected child in a foster home. It would cost only $3,000 a year to provide a family with comprehensive mental health and support services.

We believe it is both humane and economical to pay now for health-care, child-care and youth training, rather than pay later for welfare, psychiatric hospitals and prisons.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender

San Francisco's children live in the shadows of some of the world's most renowned and advanced medical institutions. Yet, the overall health status of our children is appalling. Almost half of our two-year-olds are not adequately immunized; a quarter of our pregnant mothers do not get adequate prenatal care; and our adolescents have one of the highest rates of sexually transmitted disease in the country. The number of children hospitalized at the state psychiatric facility has tripled in the past ten years. The Children's Amendment will enable San Francisco to more effectively reach out to our children with appropriate care, care that will keep our children strong and healthy and able to lead productive lives.

Abraham Rudolph, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, UCSF*
Philip Zeiring, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics/Pacific Campus, California Pacific Medical Center
Moses Grossman, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, UCSF
Martin Gershman, M.D., Chairman, California District of American Academy of Pediatrics
Paul Kulp, R.N., M.S., Golden Gate Nurses Association
Anita De Frantz, PhD., Maternal Child & Adolescent Health Board

*For identification purposes only

We are committed to the education of San Francisco's children and we believe The Children's Amendment will greatly enhance our ability to educate our children. Since Proposition 13, our public schools have had to cut sports, social workers, nurses, libraries, childcare, vocational services and after-school programs.

The Children's Amendment will help the schools by providing funding for many of the services the school district desperately needs, but can no longer afford to support.

Tom Ammiano
Caroia del Portillo
Libby Denebeim
Dan Kelly
Joanne Miller
Fred Rodriguez
Leland Yee

Members, SF Board of Education

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala
Robert Burton
William Marquis, Ph.D.
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Tim Wolfred, Ph.D.
Robert Varni

Members, SF Community College Board

Ramon Cortines, Superintendent, SFUSD
Evan Dobelle, Ed.D., Chancellor, SF Community College
Diana Schindler, President, SF PTA
Jill Wynn, President, SF Parents' Lobby

Ensuring minimum funding for City services is a desperate measure, but these are desperate times.

In the 1991-1992 budget, the Mayor and Supervisors raised MUNI fares and residential parking fees and slashed vital health and safety services while rewarding real estate speculators and out-of-town corporations and preserving pork-barrel "perks" like luxury Candlestick boxes for the politically connected.

Such regressive policies are expected, coming out of Washington and Sacramento, but when they are adopted by our own leaders, the voters must take a stand to preserve our most important resource, our children.

After all, who do these politicians expect to pay the taxes to support their salaries in the 21st Century if we fail to educate our young people to compete in the global economy. The Germans and Japanese? Robots?

Vote YES on Proposition J!

North Mission Association
David Spero, President
Brian Doohan
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We in the African American community are concerned about the disproportionate harmful impact on our community that results from the lack of a preventative focus in public policy. It is unconscionable that African Americans have the highest infant mortality rate and the largest representation in both the foster care and the juvenile justice systems. It is unacceptable for mothers who want to work to be unable to find affordable childcare.

Proposition J is the beginning of what we feel is a rational approach to addressing some of the unmet health, childcare and employment needs in our community.

 Supervisor Willie Kennedy
 Supervisor Doris Ward
 Dr. Amos Brown, Third Baptist Church
 Reverend Cecil Williams, Glide Memorial Church
 Dr. Julianne Malveaux
 Sharen Hewitt, Coalition for an African American Community Agenda
 Anita De Frants, Ph.D., National Black Child Development Institute
 Lulanne McGriff, NAACP, San Francisco
 Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
 George Newkirk
 Michael Shaw, Taxpayer
 Ronald Colthirst, Office of Assemblyman John Burton
 Espanola Jackson, District 7 Democratic Club

The most vital members of our families and our community are our children. They need special treatment and protection. We support The Children's Amendment because we believe children need the special protection of guaranteed minimum funding for children's programs.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Richard Sanchez, MD, Health Commissioner*
James Morales, Planning Commission*
Roberto Hernandez, Recreation & Park Commissioner*
Robert Sanchez, Small Business Commissioner*
Robert Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co. *
Edward Farrah, Business Executive
Mike Garza, Businessman
Maria Acosta Colon, Director, Mexican Museum
Rene de la Rosa, KQED

*For identification purposes only

The Children's Amendment is good business. Money spent on having healthy, educated productive children is not an expense. It is the best investment this city can make. As leaders of the business community, we know that the economic security of this country is in jeopardy because too many of our children are not prepared to enter the labor market. The Children's Amendment will fund critical job training programs for our youth. This training will allow our youth to move into the workforce, where they will be productive and pay taxes, rather than become dependent. Businesses have to be competitive if the U.S. economy is to stay healthy ... and businesses need to be vigilant about controlling costs if they are to be competitive. But nowhere in that equation can we forget our responsibility — individual and institution alike — to our children.

For the sake of our future, support The Children's Amendment.

Elliot Hoffman, Just Desserts
Louis Giraudo, Chairman & CEO, SF French Bread Co.
Stanley Herzstein, Chairman, World Trade Center of SF
Terese Dicks Payne, Senior Managing Director, Bear Stearns
Sue Danielson, Small Business Commission
Russell Kassman, Small Business Commission, Owner —
Kassman Piano
Jerome Dodson, The Parnassus Fund
Edward Farrah, School Apparel, Inc.
Robert Reveles, Vice President, Homestake Mining Co.*
Lawrence Simi, Businessman

Change the world of a child, and you change the world. As elected officials, we know that children often get the short end of the stick because they lack political clout. Children need the kind of special protection afforded to them by Proposition J, The Children's Amendment. Kids can't vote, but you can!

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J.

John Burton, Member of State Assembly
Senator Milton Marks
Nancy Pelosi, Member of Congress
Jackie Speier, Member of State Assembly
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Because they can’t vote San Francisco’s children do poorly each year in our city’s budget process. Our lesbian, gay and bisexual youth lack basic support services and are at great risk of suicide, violence, AIDS, dropping out of school and becoming homeless ‘throwaways.’ The Children’s Amendment will preserve minimum funding for all children and provide funding for new programs that could be used to help our youth and other underserved children.

Children are everyone’s future. If we fail to invest in our children now, both their future and ours may well be troubled, expensive, and unproductive. The Children’s Amendment will require city government to make children, to make the future, a priority.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition J.

Douglas Chan, President, Lawrence Wong, Vice President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Vincent Chao, School Principal
Claudine Cheng, National President, Organization of Chinese Americans*
Dr. Youn Chey, Executive Director, Korean Multi-Services Center*
Victor Hsi
Ray Ibay, SFPD*
Hoover Lee
Jeff Mori, Community Youth Council
Sululagi Palega, Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club
Rodolfo E. Rodis, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, President, SF Community College Governing Board
Noafaluma Tuisasopo, Samoa Mo Samoa
Vu-Duc Vuong, Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Alan Wong
Harold Yee, President, Asian Inc.
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Children’s Services

*For identification purposes only

We cannot live and work for a better future and, at the same time, neglect our children. Our children are the future, and without our efforts now, our future may be both bitter and bleak. As US Senator Daniel Moynihan has warned us: “The US today may be the first society in history where the children are much worse off than adults.”

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J. VOTE FOR THE FUTURE.

Robert Morales, Teamsters, Local 350
United Educators of San Francisco
SEIU, Local 535 — Social Services Union
Shirley Black
Michael Hardeman, Labor Leader
Upholstery Division, Local 3-U, USWA

As environmentalists we support The Children’s Amendment to protect our most important natural resource — the children. Ecology issues are human issues. We can’t protect future generations, if we don’t save the very next generation, today’s children.

Green Party of California
San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Eight thousand children are currently on waiting lists for childcare in San Francisco.
Twenty-three percent of all expectant mothers receive poor or inadequate pre-natal care.
Every day, 1,800 women and children are fed from soup lines at Glide Memorial Church and St. Anthony's Dining Room.
Child abuse is San Francisco has risen over 400% in the last five years.
Proposition J, The Children’s Amendment, will provide increased child-care, increased pre-natal care, family mental health and support centers, expanded library and after-school recreation programs.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

San Francisco Chapter, National Organization for Women Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

We can truly be a voice for the voiceless right here in our own City if we support The Children’s Amendment. We now have a whole generation of children we have failed. The Children’s Amendment will help make the City become a loving involved mother to all of its children. Help make San Francisco child-friendly. All families benefit from better recreation centers, child-care centers, libraries, health-care and social services.
Vote yes on Proposition J.

George Wesolek, Executive Director, Justice & Peace Commission, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Sister Glenn Anne McPhee, Office of Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Catholic Charities of San Francisco
Catholic Youth Organization

The most important obligation of each generation is to see that the next generation is prepared to carry on in its place. Vote to protect our future San Franciscans.
VOTE FOR THE CHILDREN’S AMENDMENT, PROPOSITION J.

Grandparents Who Care
Gray Panthers of San Francisco
Senior Action Network

A society cannot survive if it does not provide care for its children. The San Francisco Democratic Party urges all San Franciscans of every party to provide for the future now by supporting our children and grandchildren this November.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Kimiko Burton, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Lulu Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Ellen Chaitin, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Michael Hardeman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

John Figone, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Steven Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Beverly Prior, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Matthew Rothschild, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Chair of the Finance Committee, I am fully aware of the city’s fiscal problems. But I am also a parent, a former teacher, and I am deeply committed to making San Francisco an excellent place to raise children.

The budget situation for San Francisco will be difficult next year, but after that, it is projected to improve: state and federal funds are forthcoming to address law enforcement and healthcare needs and we can continue to cut bureaucratic costs. Finding an additional .5% of the general fund budget for children will not be easy, but it can be done.

FOR CHILDREN’S SAKE, VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J provides no answers to any funding problems that affect San Francisco’s children; it makes yearly budgeting even more difficult.

Vote “NO” on Proposition J

This measure would skim “from the top” 2-1/2% of the revenues from property taxes for the next ten years. The earmarking of public funds is shortsighted public policy because it deprives our public officials of the ability to adapt revenues to the ever-changing needs of the city. The money that would fund children’s programs cannot be reallocated in the future for other critical services such as law enforcement, healthcare for the elderly, AIDS, mental health and other basic programs.

On the face of it this may sound like a great idea, but the reality is that Proposition J provides no extra money to San Francisco’s coffers to address the diverse needs of our city.

Let’s not make promises we can’t keep. Vote “NO” on Proposition J.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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

NOTE: This entire section is new.
San Francisco Charter Section 6.415
6.415 Children’s Fund

(a) There is hereby established a fund to expand children’s services, which shall be called the San Francisco Children’s Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used solely to provide expanded services for children as provided in this section.

(b) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Children’s Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to Section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of one-and-one-quarter cents ($0.0125) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for the first fiscal year which begins ninety days or more after the election which approves this section, and revenues equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the following nine fiscal years. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts 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 limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter for the purposes specified in this section.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used exclusively to provide services to children less than eighteen years old, above and beyond services funded prior to adoption of this section. To this end, monies from the fund shall not be appropriated or expended to fund services provided during fiscal year 1991-1992, whether or not the cost of such services increases, or appropriated or expended for services which substitute for or replace services provided during fiscal year 1990-1991 or 1991-1992, except solely to the extent of services for which the City ceases to receive federal, state, or private agency funds which the funding agency required to be spent only on the services in question.

(d) Services for children eligible for fund assistance shall include only child care; job readiness, training and placement programs; health and social services (including pre-natal services to pregnant adult women); educational programs; recreation; delinquency prevention; and library services, in each case for children. Services for children paid for by the fund shall not include:

1. (example for example and not for purposes of limitation, services provided by the police department or other law enforcement agencies; by courts, the district attorney, public defender or city attorney; by the fire department; detention or probation services mandated by state or federal law; or public transportation;
2. any service which benefits children incidentally or as members of a larger population including adults;
3. any service for which a fixed or minimum level of expenditure is mandated by state or federal law, to the extent of the fixed or minimum level of expenditure;
4. acquisition of any capital item not for primary and direct use by children;
5. acquisition (other than by lease for a term of ten years or less) of any real property; or
6. maintenance, utilities or any similar operating cost of any facility not used primarily and directly by children, or of any recreation or park facility (including a zoo), library facility or hospital.

(e) During each fiscal year, a minimum of twenty five percent (25%) of said fund shall be used for child care, a minimum of twenty five percent (25%) for job readiness, training and placement and a minimum of twenty five percent (25%) for health and social services for children (including pre-natal services for pregnant adult women). Beginning with the fifth fiscal year during which funds are set aside under this section, the Board of Supervisors may modify or eliminate these minimum requirements.

(f) Not later than three months after the election which approves this section and not later than December of each calendar year which begins after said election, the Mayor shall prepare and present to the Board of Supervisors a Children’s Services Plan. The plan shall propose goals and objectives for the fund for the fiscal year beginning the following July 1, propose expenditures of monies from the fund for the fiscal year beginning the following July 1 and designate the city departments which would administer the funded programs. In connection with preparation of the Children’s Services Plan, and (except in connection with the first Children’s Services Plan) prior to the date required for presentation to the Board, the Health Commission, Juvenile Probation Commission, Social Services Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission and Public Library Commission shall each hold at least one public hearing on the Plan. Joint hearings may be held to satisfy this requirement. Any or all of the commissions may also hold additional hearings before or after presentation of the Plan.

(g) The fund shall be used exclusively to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for those services for children which are eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law). To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of such City appropriations for eligible services (not including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund and exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law) in any of the ten years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the higher of the amount so appropriated for the fiscal year 1990-1991 or the amount so appropriated for the fiscal year 1991-1992, in either case as adjusted. Not later than three months after the election which approves this section, the Controller shall calculate and publish the applicable base amount, specifying by department and program each amount included in the base amount. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each year after the base year, based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations from the base year, as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by an adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through 2001-2002, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for services for children which are eligible to be paid from the fund (exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law).

(h) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?
Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday, November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. on Election Day. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on Election Day.
PROPOSITION K

Shall the City repeal the ordinance which allows two unmarried, unrelated adults who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses to formally establish their relationship as a "domestic partnership"?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: At the November 6, 1990 election San Francisco voters approved the Domestic Partners Ordinance. It allows two unmarried adults who live together and agree to share basic living expenses to establish formally their relationship as a domestic partnership. The Domestic Partners Ordinance also sets out procedures for establishing and ending a domestic partnership.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to repeal the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Domestic Partners Ordinance to remain in effect.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

If the Ordinance is repealed, in my opinion, it should not increase or decrease the cost of government.

How "K" Got on the Ballot
On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition K to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 24, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,320 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,921 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

"DOMESTIC PARTNERS" IS DISHONEST!
The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have betrayed the People! They promised domestic partners, (DP) would cost nothing, then immediately enacted benefits costing millions of dollars!

BAD FOR BUSINESS!
Under threats of litigation, businesses will be forced to pay higher benefits for DPs, a move that will surely drive more businesses out of San Francisco! . . . Or offer no benefits to any employee!

OFFENSIVE TO RELIGIONS!
Government sanctioned quasi-marriages continue to offend traditional cultural standards of Islam, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity. A small interest group puts its wants ahead of hundreds of generations; collective wisdom!

- Our whole system of laws and government is based upon concepts of right and wrong derived from biblical standards. In fact, “We hold these truths to be self-evident!” Religion is not the enemy of freedom and good government; tyrannical fanaticism is.

“DOMESTIC PARTNERS” IS ILLEGAL
Wrong approaches produce wrong results. If domestic partner-ship is good, why do insurers insist DPs are significantly more expensive to insure? Our City Charter, since 1972, has defined "dependent" as spouse and children. By what right is the Charter expanded to include DPs as dependents? Only the People have powers to amend the Charter of San Francisco!

DESTRUCTIVE of COMMUNITY!
- Faith in FAIR, HONEST GOVERNMENT is being destroyed by deceptive reporting of Health Service costs. The Mayor's plan to shift The City’s AIDS funding onto the backs of City workers — especially RETIRED City workers! Despite efforts to conceal added costs to legitimate benefit plan members, rates have already gone up, shortfalls are being paid out of reserve funds, and there is no end in sight!
- Cynical domination of the well meaning majority by a greedy, minority in the name of "respect" destroys democratic goodwill!

VOTE YES ON K! REPEAL “DOMESTIC PARTNERS” ORDINANCE!

Gingivan Randolph
San Franciscans for Responsible Government

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The proponent of Proposition K implies that repealing the Domestic Partnership law will save businesses and the city money. That’s nonsense.

He makes this deceitful argument because he knows voters won’t accept his true purpose: to get rid of this cost-free law which lets couples who agree to care for each other register at City Hall.

The Domestic Partnership law has been on the books for a year. Not one business has been forced to pay higher benefits for domestic partners. That’s because the law doesn’t require anyone to provide any benefits to domestic partners.

Proposition K won’t save the City any health care costs either. That’s because Proposition K will have no effect on the City’s health plan at all. Proposition K repeals the law which allows domestic partners of city employees to buy coverage in the city’s health plan.

In fact, the City Controller’s official analysis of Prop. K says that it won’t save taxpayers a cent.

Allowing couples who agree to be legally responsible for each other to file a statement at City Hall is the least we can do to show respect for these important, vital relationships.

Keep the Domestic Partnership law.
Vote No On K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.
Absent: Supervisor Brit.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Since the voters passed the Domestic Partnership law last November, hundreds of San Francisco couples have shown their dedication to each other by registering as domestic partners. By doing that, they have made their commitment to care for each other both public and legally binding.

Many of the couples who have pledged themselves to each other as domestic partners are lesbians and gay men, who have no other means of legally recognizing their relationships.

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to take this away. Proposition K claims to be designed to end the city’s policy of allowing the domestic partners of city employees to participate (at their own expense) in the city’s health plan. Not true.

The health policy was adopted by the Health Services Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors because both Boards thought it was only fair. But whether you agree with this or not, Proposition K will have no effect on the health plan whatsoever.

Proposition K won’t save taxpayers one cent.

The only thing that Proposition K does is to repeal the law which allows lesbian, gay, and other unmarried couples to register their relationships. The health plan policy wouldn’t be changed at all.

Proposition K is a deceptive and cynical attempt to use arguments about health benefits to get rid of the registration law.

The Domestic Partners law has cost the city nothing. All of its administration has been paid for by the fees paid by the couples who register. The Domestic Partnership law has helped give all San Franciscans the respect they deserve. Keep the Domestic Partnership law and reject this deceptive political initiative. VOTE NO ON K.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.


Absent: Supervisor Migden.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

In 1989, the voters rejected DP (domestic partnerships) because it was a clear giveaway of “special privileges” to a “special interest” group. Mayor Agnos and his allies have called them “mean-spirited” because they disagreed. Agnos and his cronies give people who disagree with them “mean” labels. Their tactics are clear.

San Francisco voters have been supportive of legitimate needs of citizens. But they cannot be intimidated anymore by the mean-spirited politics of a vocal few! Fireman and long-time president of the Health Board, Harry Pareetchan, wrote about effects DP will have.

He wrote:

Never before has an issue been presented to the Board with such far reaching negative ramifications upon our membership and system. All the testimony, documentation and evidence fell on deaf ears. They knew exactly what they were going to do before they entered the room. They cared not for the membership who must now pay increased rates to fund domestic partners.

I’ve never seen a better “orchestrated” scenario in my twenty year career on the board. The Mayor’s appointee, Jack Loos was the “conductor,” The “fix” was in; Increases will effect members in ALL categories, INCLUDING RETIREEs. Did any of these individuals seem to care? The answer: NO! They received their orders from “CITY HALL”

Mr. Agnos tell us the full truth; Money is taken away from families and children, the disabled, homeless and seniors to allocate MILLIONS for Special Interest health coverage.

PROPOSITION “K” WILL SAVE MILLIONS! PLEASE VOTE YES ON K

SRG, Gingmon Randolph

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Domestic Partners isn’t a Civil Rights issue. We as minority women take offense in that the special interest promoting Domestic Partners are attempting to get special privileges on the basis of an unnatural sexual conduct.

Civil Rights have always applied to people of unchangeable characteristics such as skin color, sex, or severe handicaps. Homosexuals are attempting to get “Elite Status” on a “behavior” that can be modified.

DON’T BE MISLED, VOTE YES ON K.

Brenda Williams
Chiang Ngah Cheong

“No City Benefits” said the Domestic Partners people. Then, quickly and underhandedly, they took City Benefits. This flagrant dishonesty comes as no surprise.

The sages have said, “Break ye down sexual fences, and, ultimately, other moral/ethical fences will fall.” Let us not allow our City to officially recognize these relationships that break down sexual fences, lest, thereby, we invite the corruption of moral/ethical values all around. Please repeal the Domestic Partners measure now.

Please vote Yes on K.

Rabbi Leib Feldman

Honesty is part of good society. The direction taken by supporters of domestic partners is dishonest. During the campaign for domestic partners, the proponents argued that this measure was about “recognition” not “benefits”. Within one week of passage, their campaign manager said that “benefits” were the goal.

City government granted domestic partners benefits. Their next goal is similar recognition and benefits from firms doing business with the city, then recognition and benefits from private firms in general.

Supporters claim domestic partners costs employers nothing, but insurance providers have indicated that increases in rates for everyone will be part of any domestic partners coverage. Business can’t afford these increased costs.

Vote for less government interference with business.

Vote Yes on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian, Business Owner

Board of Supervisors:
“As a retired City employee I most vehemently oppose “domestic partners” being added to present health care coverage. I gave all my energies in 20 years of employment for the City expecting in return to get benefits to cover my retirement years. Now my security is being eroded by increases in program costs, and by an immoral proposition which the Board is bending to under political pressure.” Helen Governale

Above is a genuine letter sent to our Supervisors. This letter was among many, all were against benefits! San Franciscans for Responsible Government, (SRG) salutes retired city employees for their years of service. If you’re a city employee, active or retired and feel the pinch on your finances, SRG is here to help. Together we will make a difference! Help this campaign, send $15.00 for membership, more if you can. SRG Box 347321, San Francisco, CA 94134

San Franciscans for Responsible Government is a broad based multi-ethnic coalition, composed of individuals from business, religious and community institutions, dedicated to restoring honesty and accountability in City government.

Karen Wong

The Supervisors and Mayor illegally enacted legislation, that provides live-in lovers of municipal employees a share of San Francisco health program, irrespective of their medical condition. Federal and San Francisco health plans explicitly limit coverage to employee’s spouse and children (Section 8.428).

San Francisco is a city governed by charter, which can only be altered by a vote of the people. If Mayor Agnos and the Supervisors wish to change the word “spouse” to read Domestic Partners (DP), then by law, it must be submitted to a vote. Therefore, an employee’s live-in lover is not eligible to participate in the health service system.

The Mayor has said he will continue offering health benefits to live-in lovers even if DP is repealed, thereby, compounding the illegality. However, without DP it will be impossible to identify eligible candidates. Our politicians have positioned themselves above the law. This action, if allowed will set a precedent for future violations. Therefore, send a strong message to City Hall.

Reject this violation of our rights! Vote YES on K.

Marcel Wetland
San Franciscans for Responsible Government

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

Let’s send a strong message to those who have betrayed the trust of The People. The Mayor, Supervisors and special interest have arrogantly granted “domestic partners” (DP) benefits that will cost our city millions! Now the burden is being placed on the backs of retired city workers! How shameful! After years of dedicated service, is this how we want to repay our civil servants?

This law if left standing will in a short time explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our city! It is so loosely written that attorneys are calling it “a new field in law.”

DID YOU KNOW THAT DPs DON’T EVEN NEED TO LIVE IN SF TO GET BENEFITS!

Fed up? San Franciscans for Responsible Government represents you. Together we will make a difference! Please send what you can to help this campaign. Become a member: Send $15.00, more if you can, SRG Box 347321 San Francisco, CA 94134

Marcel Weiland

Robert Achtenberg lost a case defining dependents of employee’s families. In Hinman v Personnel Administration, a homosexual tried to establish his partner as his spouse to qualify him for benefits. The court held the state’s policy promoting marriage advances by confirming statutory rights on married partners. Without legislation no basis exists for extending rights to nonmarital relations. Only a man and woman can marry. (Civ. Code 4100). Are our “leaders” treating domestic partners as married? This isn’t legal. San Francisco health plans limit coverage to employee’s spouses and dependents. The voters reaffirmed this seven times. An employee’s friend is not eligible to participate in the health service system. Yes on K will repeal the basis for the Mayor’s illegal acts!

The charter provides “It shall be the duty to apply benefits without special favor or privilege.” Granting health benefits to domestic partners is a special favor and privilege. Harry Paretochan, President of Health Board, claims a fix was in before the April 1991 meeting of the Health Board.

The Board met to reduce health premiums. Now increases will take effect. Is this equitable? Does it make sense to allow domestic partners benefits and to deny it to mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers? Not unless you are beholden to the gay political machine. Send a message to the fools in silly hall. Just say no to special interests. Say no to domestic partners. Yes on K.

Russell Davis

Promoters of domestic partners now talk of forcing private businesses to pay for benefits! How will this affect our business community? Will businesses be driven out of San Francisco to avoid more government regulations and an increasingly hostile business environment? Could this affect our tax base? Our jobs?

They promised us domestic partners would cost nothing! Can we afford to find out how much it’ll really cost?

VOTE YES ON “K”!

Tim Robinson

Vote Yes on K. Stop extending city administered health insurance fringe benefits to any friend, an active or retired municipal employee, 46,000, chooses to designate a domestic partner and that person’s dependents.

Vote K yes. Repeal the domestic partners law. Health insurance is a voter mandated fringe benefit still restricted by Charter laws to employees and dependents. Neither the Mayor, supervisors nor ordinance of any kind may modify Charter laws. Our Supervisors without legal authority, contrary to laws enacted legislation including domestic partners in this health insurance program. State and federal laws prohibits persons of the same sex from marrying. Consequently, employees’ friends, unless legal spouses, or dependents may not be granted these benefits.

Vote K — Yes, granting a city fringe to friends of employees is powerful evidence that our civic leaders think they can ignore voter laws. Vote Yes. Show them they’re wrong.

Vote yes — Unless domestic partner law is repealed, health insurance cost, for everyone, not only municipal workers will skyrocket beyond affordability of many people.

Vote yes — If the Mayor and supervisors are allowed to get away with this mockery they will soon be dipping into the multi-million dollar fund for retired employees’ pension.

Vote yes — All of our elected representatives as well as the mayoral candidates are aware that extending a city fringe to persons other than municipal employees is illegal. But don’t expect any of them to have the courage to oppose or even criticize this illegal legislation.

John Barbagelata
Former Supervisor
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

"In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law."
- United States Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, 1896
95 years later, some people still don’t get it.
NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Labor unions representing 79,000 San Francisco workers have supported our city’s domestic partnership program. Join us in voting NO ON K, to stop the repeal of domestic partnership rights.

Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO

San Francisco Tomorrow is an environmental group working to improve the quality of life in the City. The Domestic Partners law does just that for many. Vote to keep it. Vote NO on K!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Please stand with me and reject this attack on lesbians and gay men. Voters of San Francisco adopted the domestic partners ordinance last year. No sooner did voters act when a misguided group launched a repeal drive.

This repeal saves taxpayers nothing. It does not take back health benefits. It just strips away the rights of domestic partners to register their relationships.

Help affirm the rights of every person to justice, respect, and freedom from discrimination. I urge you to reject bigotry, and put an end to this annual ballot bashing against our own people.

Stop the repeal of domestic partners.

Richard D. Hongisto
Mayoral Candidate

Simple Fairness.
Gay and lesbian families deserve the same standing, benefits, and respect as all families.

Michael S. Bernick, BART Director
James Fang, BART Director

The Domestic Partners law passed by the voters acknowledges the existence of loving, committed relationships, providing certain basic rights to registered domestic partners. To oppose recognizing lesbian and gay domestic partnerships is anti-gay bigotry.

Gloria Estela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

Proposition K is a mean-spirited attempt to deny recognition of an important element of the diverse family life that has been the hallmark of San Francisco. As Chair of the Mayor’s Task Force on Family Policy, I studied San Francisco’s families. As a candidate for elected office, I campaigned for domestic partnerships. As Supervisor, I have voted to support domestic partnerships as well as other families that contribute so much to San Francisco.

The repeal of the domestic partnership registration system takes away the ability of couples, both gay and straight, to pledge their legally binding commitment to one another and the City’s ability to recognize that commitment. Repealing domestic partnerships serves no valid public purpose.

I urge you to vote no on Proposition K.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Last year the Board of Supervisors passed and the voters upheld the Domestic Partners Ordinance.

The proponents committed that there would be no cost to the taxpayers as a result. This commitment has been honored.

Now there is an attempt to prevent the Health Service Board from allowing domestic partners to provide health insurance for their partners at no expense to the public. All City employees are already required to pay the health costs of any spouse, partner or dependent.

It is foolish and mean spirited to try to prevent City workers from providing health care insurance for their loved ones at their own expense.

Please join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Last year, we fought FOR Proposition K. This time we are fighting AGAINST Proposition K. But the principle remains the same: Domestic Partnership is a fair and just way to recognize lesbian, gay and other non-traditional families.
Join me in voting NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Your mother told you not to hate anybody.
Listen to your mother.
NO ON K. UPHOLD CIVIL RIGHTS.

The Process Group

Domestic Partnership is about Justice. The measure passed by the voters last year requires no city tax dollars; it is completely self-supporting. Support of Domestic Partnership and opposition to Proposition K represents the consensus position of the elected leadership of San Francisco.
The Domestic Partners ordinance provides a legal registry to foster respect for lesbian, gay and other unmarried couples. This is one way San Francisco can address the discrimination and neglect they face. We urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition K, so that our city can continue to officially encourage loving and caring families.

Nancy Pelosi, United States Congress
Milton Marks, California Senate
Willie Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly
John Burton, California Assembly

None of the horrors predicted by the opponents of the original partners legislation came to pass. This sour grapes proposition would repeal a law that is working just fine, hurting no one, and not costing taxpayers a dime. San Francisco works best when we respect each other, and this measure accords respect to lesbians and gays and other committed couples.

Mary Art Agnos

Communities of color have always led the fight for equality and challenged the discrimination which designated “white” only jobs, schools and recreational facilities or immigration laws which separate our families. Domestic Partnership is the only law to allow the participation of lesbian and gay couples to have family status. It is the only mechanism to register their relationships to allow them equal treatment.
We must stand together with the lesbian and gay members of our own African American, Latino, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Native American communities and with all lesbian and gay couples who seek equal treatment for their relationships. Proposition K would repeal the domestic partners law and prevent these couples the same public recognition and respect of their relationships that we give others. Let us protect this step towards dignity and the fair treatment of all. Don’t allow these rights to be taken away. Vote No on Proposition K.

Ignatius Bau
Barbara Cameron
Henry Der
Tessie Guillermo
Ericka Huggins
Don Masuda
Enola Maxwell
Jose Medina
Barbara Neighbors-Glass
Ruth Picon
Karen Pierce
Leonila Ramirez
Rodel Rodis
Mabel Teng
Doris Thomas
Leland Yee
Vu-Duc Vuong
Lawrence Wong
Alan Wong

There’s one issue on which all of the major candidates for Mayor agree. We’re all voting NO on Proposition K.
Proposition K is a deceptive and misguided attempt to repeal the domestic partners law that San Francisco voters passed last year.
The domestic partners law has worked well, providing legal recognition of the diversity of family life in our city — at no cost to taxpayers.
Proposition K perpetuates divisiveness and bigotry when we should be striving for mutual respect.
Join us in voting NO on Proposition K.

Art Agnos
Angela Alioto
Richard Hongisto
Tom Hsieh
Frank Jordan
Domestic Partnership is an issue of CHOICE! The lesbian and gay community, with the approval of San Francisco voters, has created a process for the city to recognize their relationships through a registration system, since they are not legally eligible for marriage. A small section of religious fundamentalists are trying to overturn this legislation. They want to impose their lifestyles on the entire population — preventing women from exercising their right to choice relating to pregnancy — preventing lesbian and gay couples from exercising their right to the choice of loving relationships of their own sex.

If we cannot demonstrate the importance of maintaining our freedom of choice here in San Francisco, it will surely be endangered throughout the country. Vote No on Proposition K.

Regina Gabrielle, Executive Director, Womens’ Building
Helen Greico, S.F. National Organization for Women PAC
Roma Guy, Founder Womens’ Building
Leni Marin, Chair, S.F. Commission on the Status of Women

Almost everyone has lost a friend, relative, co-worker or lover to AIDS. Our city has witnessed a crisis beyond all scope but we have seen an enormous amount of caring and love that has poured out in response to the AIDS epidemic.

The lesbian/gay community, through its response to AIDS and in a hundred other ways, has shown it has the power to love and care. A “No” vote on Proposition K will continue domestic partnership and continue to recognize the love and commitment shared by lesbian and gay couples, and will bring all our communities together as part of the family of San Francisco.

Valentine Aguirre, Latino Coalition on AIDS/SIDA
Angela Davis, Bayview Hunter’s Point Foundation
Anne Guillory-Thom, American Indian AIDS Institute
Pat Norman, California AIDS Intervention
Eric Rejes, Shanti Project
Lee Woo, Black and White Men Together

The San Francisco Democratic Party Supports Domestic Partnerships. By an overwhelming majority, the Central Committee has voted to maintain Domestic Partnerships and to oppose Proposition K.

The Democratic Party has a strong tradition of support for civil rights and individual freedoms.

In San Francisco, let us define what we consider a family.
Join your local Democratic Party in recognizing the diversity of families in our city.

We urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION K.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic Party
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O’Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Greg Day, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lulu M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

(organizations for identification purposes only)
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

"Equal" rights has to apply to everyone. Or it really isn’t "equal" at all.
Whatever improvements might be needed in the existing “domestic partners” legislation, its basic goal is to stop discrimination against minorities.
That’s in the interest of all minorities — and we add up to a majority.
Proposition K would bring back discrimination against one minority. If it passes, which minority will be next?

Grassroots

All San Franciscans deserve fairness, justice, and the support of family.
Domestic partners registration costs the city nothing.
We admire the care that strengthens our entire San Francisco family.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K.

Veronica Abrisar, Catholic
Reverend Steven Allen, Zen
Jorge Arango, Catholic
Reverend Louis Ashley, Glide Memorial
Reverend Mary Atwood, Episcopal
Danny Barutta, Catholic
Dorothy Beattie, Integrity
Rabbi Allen Bennett, American Jewish Congress
Reverend Susan Bergmam, Episcopalian
Reverend Walter Bock, Lutheran
Reverend Jerene Broadway, Southern Baptist
Kevin Calegari, Catholic
Reverend Robert Cromey, Episcopal
Reverend James DeLange, Lutheran
Reverend Paul Dirdak, Methodist
Reverend Judith Favor, United Church of Christ
Brother Derek Ford, Jail Chaplaincy
Reverend Ruth Frost, Lutheran
Marilyn Geist, Integrity
Reverend Lee Gerdes, Lutheran
Darlene Giusti, Catholic
Reverend Peter Hayn, Episcopalian
Reverend Michael Herz, Presbyterian
Reverend Glenda Hope, Presbyterian
Reverend Neil Housewright, Disciples of Christ
Father James Jelinek, Episcopalian
Reverend Jeff Johnson, Lutheran
Rabbi Yael Kahn, Sha'ar Zahav
Reverend Chuck Lewis, Night Ministry
Reverend James Lowder, Southern Baptist
Reverend Jane Medema, Southern Baptist
Reverend Canon Michael Merriman, Grace Cathedral
Rabbi David Meyer
Frederick Millen, James Markunas Society
Reverend James Mitsulski, Metropolitan Community Church
Bob Nelson, Lutherans Concerned
William Raites, Episcopalian
James Rix, Evangelicals Concerned
Reverend Penny Sarvis, United Church of Christ
Reverend Jane Spahr, Presbyterian
Reverend Buddy Trulock, Metropolitan Community Church
Father Tom West, o.f.m., Catholic
Reverend Mickey Williamson, United Church of Christ
Rabbi Peretz Wolf-Prusan, Emanu-El
Reverend Phyllis Zilhara, Lutheran

"Populations of whiptail lizards in the southwestern U.S., Mexico and South America consist of females only."
"The animals are unusual among vertebrates in reproducing by parthenogenesis: virgin birth."
— Scientific American 1/84

Religious extremists oppose Domestic Partners because their interpretation of Scripture tells them homosexuality is “unnatural”. Those scriptures can’t explain why scientists have found so much homosexuality in nature — including five species of lesbian lizards. These “whiptails” reproduce without males.
Yet a solitary female can’t reproduce — she has to go through a sexual “mating dance” with another female before she can ovulate!

“Scriptures” were what we had before books were invented. Taboos on “adultery” and “sodomy” served to reduce sexually transmitted diseases; other ways were unknown.
Times change. Rigid sexual taboos are obsolete. Condoms protect much more reliably than sermons.
Don’t bring back an antiquated discrimination. Vote NO.

Grassroots
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

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

The People amend The San Francisco Administrative Code by Repealing Chapter 62.1 through 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance.

Sec. 1. HISTORY

(a) The Domestic Partners Ordinance was initially proposed in San Francisco during the Feinstein Administration. It was approved by the Board of Supervisors but vetoed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. In 1989 the Domestic Partners Ordinance was again approved by The Board of Supervisors and was signed into law by Mayor Art Agnos. The Domestic Partners Ordinance was then rejected by the People in a referendum vote known as Proposition "K".

(b) In 1990 The Board of Supervisors again approved and proposed a modified version of the Domestic Partners Ordinance known as Proposition "K". Having removed the costly health benefits provision, The Board of Supervisors promoted the Domestic Partners Ordinance as a symbolic initiative to give homosexual relationships formal recognition. The People of San Francisco were promised in the official ballot arguments, by The Board of Supervisors, and special interest groups, that proposition "K", the Domestic Partners Ordinance would not put a financial burden on the City or citizens. The proponents promised that the Domestic Partners Ordinance would be fully funded by its registrants.

(c) In June of 1991, The Board of Supervisors voted to offer a costly health benefits package to unmarried couples registered as Domestic Partners, and employed by the City. Mayor Art Agnos has indicated that he will sign the bill into law.

(d) The Supervisors who approved and submitted proposition "K" before The People are: Alioto, Brit, Gonzalez, Hallman, Kennedy, Maier, Nolder, Walker, and Ward.

Sec. 2. FINDINGS

(a) Whereas, The People of San Francisco have been misled by their elected Supervisors, and the special interest groups supporting the Domestic Partners ordinance, into believing that no monetary benefits would be granted to domestic partnerships.

(b) Whereas, The Board of Supervisors, after removing the controversial health benefits package, and promised to The People, that this measure was cost free, have now circumvented their promise and The People of San Francisco by approving health benefits.

(c) Whereas, Insurance companies covering City employees have asked for an estimated $2,000,000.00 (two million) or more, to expand coverage to domestic partners for the first year.

(d) Whereas, due to the likelihood of a large percentage of A.I.D.S. H.I.V. related claims, the estimated $2,000,000.00 (two million) for the first year will most likely be much higher in subsequent years.

(e) Whereas, health premiums to city employees, and retired City workers with fixed incomes will be increased to cover the health benefits granted to these unmarried domestic partners.

(f) Whereas, The Domestic Partners Ordinance threatens the City millions of dollars in court costs due to the vagueness of the text. The Domestic Partners Ordinance allows one partner to sue the other for "failure to give notice". It is also unclear as to what will happen to the property, or the children of these domestic partners once they break up. The Domestic Partners Ordinance is a litigation time bomb that threatens to explode with catastrophic financial impact upon our City.

Sec. 3. By the will of The People of San Francisco

(a) The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by repealing in its entirety Chapter 62.1 to 62.8 The Domestic Partners Ordinance.

The following is the text of the ordinance which would be repealed by Proposition K.

RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

Sec. 62.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this ordinance is to create a way to recognize intimate committed relationships, including those of lesbians and gay men who otherwise are denied the right to identify the partners with whom they share their lives. All costs of registration must be covered by fees to be established by ordinance.

Sec. 62.2. DEFINITIONS

(a) Domestic Partnership. Domestic Partners are two adults who have chosen to share one another's lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring, who live together, and who have agreed to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses incurred during the Domestic Partnership. They must sign a Declaration of Domestic Partnership, and establish the partnership under section 3 of this chapter.

(b) "Live Together." "Live together" means that two people share the same living quarters. It is not necessary that the legal right to possess the quarters be in both of their names. Two people may live together even if one or both have additional living quarters. Domestic Partners do not cease to live together if one leaves the shared quarters but intends to return.

(c) "Basic Living Expenses." "Basic living expenses" means the cost of basic food and shelter. It also includes the expenses which are paid at least in part by a program or benefit for which the partner qualified because of the domestic partnership. The individuals need not contribute equally or jointly to the cost of these expenses as long as they agree that both are responsible for the costs.

(d) "Declaration of Domestic Partnership." A "Declaration of Domestic Partnership" is a form provided by the County Clerk. By signing it, two people agree to be jointly responsible for basic living expenses which they incur during the domestic partnership and that this agreement can be enforced by anyone to whom those expenses are owed. They also state under penalty of perjury that they met the definition of domestic partnership when they signed the statement, that neither is married, that they are not related to each other in a way which would bar marriage in California, and that neither had a different domestic partner less than six months before they signed. This last condition does not apply if the previous domestic partner died. The form will also require each partner to provide a mailing address. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.3. ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a) Methods. Two persons may establish a Domestic Partnership by either:

1. Presenting a signed Declaration of Domestic Partnership to the County Clerk, who will file it and give the partner a certificate showing that the Declaration was filed; or

2. Having a Declaration of Domestic Partnership notarized and giving a copy to the person who witnessed the signing (who may or may not be the notary).

(b) Time Limitation. A person cannot become a member of a Domestic Partnership until at least six months after any other Domestic Partnership of which he or she was a member ended. This does not apply if the earlier domestic partnership ended because one of the members died.

(c) Residence Limitation. The County Clerk will only file Declaration of Domestic Partnership if:

1. The partners have a residence in San Francisco; or

2. At least one of the partners works in San Francisco. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.4 ENDING DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS

(a) When the Partnership Ends. A Domestic Partnership ends when:

1. One partner sends the other a written notice that he or she has ended the partnership; or

2. One of the partners dies; or

3. One of the partners marries or the partners no longer live together.

(b) Notice the Partnership Has Ended.

(1) To Domestic Partners. When a Domestic Partnership ends, at least one of the partners must sign a notice saying that the partnership has ended. The notice must be dated and signed under penalty of perjury. If the Declaration of Domestic Partnership was filed with the County Clerk, the notice must be filed with the clerk; otherwise, the notice must be notarized. The partner who signs the notice must send a copy to the other partner.

(2) To Third Parties. When a Domestic Partnership ends, a Domestic Partner who has given a copy of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership to any third party, (or, if that partner has died, the surviving member of the domestic partnership) must give that third party a notice signed under penalty of perjury stating the partnership has ended. The notice must be sent within 60 days of the end of the Domestic Partnership.

(3) Failure to Give Notice. Failure to give either of the notices required by this subsection

(Continued on next page)
will neither prevent nor delay termination of the Domestic Partnership. Anyone who suffers any loss as a result of failure to send either of these notices may sue for actual losses.

Sec. 62.5. COUNTY CLERK’S RECORDS

(a). Amendments to Declarations. A Partner may amend a Declaration of Domestic Partnership filed with the County Clerk at any time to show a change in his or her mailing address.

(b). New Declarations of Domestic Partnership. No person who has filed a declaration of Domestic Partnership with the County Clerk may file another declaration of Domestic Partnership until six months after a notice the partnership has ended has been filed. However, if the Domestic Partnership ended because one of the partners died, a new Declaration may be filed anytime after the notice the partnership ended is filed.

(c). Maintenance of County Clerk’s Records. The County Clerk will keep a record of all Declarations of Domestic Partnership, amendments to Declarations of Domestic Partnership and all notices that a partnership has ended. The records will be maintained so that amendments and notices a partnership has ended are filed with the Declaration of Domestic Partnership to which they apply.

(d). Filing Fees. The Board of Supervisors will set the filing fee for Declarations of Domestic Partnership and Amendments. No fee will be charged for notices that a partnership has ended. The fees charged must cover the city’s cost of administering this ordinance. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.6. LEGAL EFFECT OF DECLARATION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a). Obligations. The obligations of domestic partners to each other are those described by the definition.

(b). Duration of Rights and Duties. If a domestic partnership ends, the partners incur no further obligations to each other. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.7. CODIFICATION. Upon adoption, the Clerk of the Board shall codify this amendment into the San Francisco Administrative Code. (Added by Proposition K, 11/6/90)

Sec. 62.8. FILING FEES. For each filing of a Declaration of Domestic Partnership and each Amendment to a Declaration of Domestic Partnership the County Clerk shall charge a fee of $35. (Added by Ord. 2-91, App. 1/14/91)
HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME’S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333

MOVED?
Any time you move, you must re-register to vote. Call 554-4375 and a registration form will be sent to you.
Phelan Avenue Use

PROPOSITION L
Shall the ordinance rezoning the Phelan Loop located at Ocean and Phelan streets across from City College from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) be adopted?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City owns about 30 acres of property on Phelan Avenue across from City College. The Balboa Reservoirs cover about 28 acres of this property. The “Phelan Loop,” at the corner of Phelan and Ocean, occupies about another 2 acres. There is a bookstore and a turn-around for Muni buses on the Phelan Loop.

The City is negotiating to have built on the Phelan Loop: 120 units of affordable housing for seniors, about 9300 square feet of commercial space, 3250 square feet of office space, a Muni drivers’ rest stop, and parking for 57 cars.

The Phelan Loop is currently zoned “P” (Public Use District). This means that it can be used only for public purposes. The Phelan Loop must be rezoned before the proposed development could be allowed. The Planning Commission has approved the proposed development but only if the Phelan Loop is rezoned.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed an ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). Before that ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would approve the ordinance to rezone the Phelan Loop from “P” (Public Use District) to “NC-2” (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial District). The proposed development would be permitted if the Phelan Loop is rezoned “NC-2.”

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from “P” to “NC-2” to go into effect.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance changing the zoning of the Phelan Loop from “P” to “NC-2” to be rejected.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How “L” Got on the Ballot
On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition L to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 12, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 23,420 of the signatures submitted were valid, 4,622 more than the required number of signatures.
Phelan Avenue Use

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

A YES VOTE ON Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing, a new MUNI driver restroom and some 9,300 square feet of neighborhood serving retail space will be built in a location that presently houses only a MUNI stop along Ocean Avenue. This two acre parcel is not now nor has it ever been a part of City College and it’s development as affordable senior rental housing will in no way impair the ability of City College to expand into the “Balboa Reservoir” to the north.

San Francisco’s senior population, which numbers more than any other Bay Area County, both as a percentage of the total population and in absolute numbers, critically needs this housing. Ocean View critically needs this infusion of neighborhood serving retail space. The rezoning is consistent with the neighborhood commercial use of this portion of Ocean Avenue and it’s 40 foot height limitation is actually some 20 feet below the maximum allowable height. The rezoning and development of this senior affordable rental housing is a win-win situation for our City’s seniors, the local neighborhood and City College. In fact, right now over 2,000 seniors attend City College, and many of them could qualify for the proposed housing.

Vote Yes for senior housing, vote Yes for neighborhood serving businesses, vote Yes for improved MUNI driver facilities; Vote Yes for Proposition L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Maher, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisor Hsieh

Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

---------------------------

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I disagree with Art Agnos when he says this land is not needed by City College. That has been his claim through three elections, and he is still wrong.

Housing can go elsewhere, City College can’t.

Education, of primary importance to the children of our city, is in deep trouble. Lack of education is a root cause of unemployment, resulting poverty, homelessness, crime and drug abuse.

As the world becomes technologically advanced, it becomes imperative we expand and improve our educational system. For children of lower and middle income families, City College provides their last if not their only opportunity for an affordable college education.

To support our future and the future of our children, we must support City College. Who owned this land in the past is not an issue.

The issue is whether we are going to support City College.

Richard Hongo

I concur. Remember when AGNOS TRIED TO SELL 11.6 ACRES of the campus to a developer for $36,900? This is part of the same piece of land.

I was active in liberal politics long before Art Agnos arrived, carpetbag in hand. I say HONGISTO HAS THE BEST CHANCE OF RESCUING OUR CITY

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

John Riordan, City College Board Emeritus

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

WHAT AGAIN?

Incredibly, this is the FOURTH TIME this issue has been on the ballot.

This is part of the Balboa Reservoir that was once part of the CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS. Repeatedly the voters of San Francisco have refused to rezone part of the old West Campus. Repeatedly they have voted to give it back to the college.

Since then, the college has made plans for the land. But here they are back again with a last ditch effort to divert part of the land into private hands.

The land is the same, the issues are the same, even the letter of the proposition is the same. The voters said "L NO!" three years ago, and should say the same again.

This is about EDUCATION.

This is about COMMUNITY COLLEGE LAND.

This is about access to affordable education for CHILDREN OF LOWER INCOME AND WORKING CLASS FAMILIES.

City College serves all incomes, but for many it is the college of last resort. It has become the BIGGEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN THE WORLD cramped into the smallest campus in the state.

This land is crucial to the planned and much needed development of the "West Campus." It is presently occupied by the California bookstore, a needed college serving facility, and the City College Station, the key transportation hub of the campus.

Liberals, conservatives, and moderates support City College and the surrounding neighborhood on this issue. See separate arguments by Candidate for Mayor RICHARD HONGisto and State Senator QUENTIN KOPP. Also urging you to vote NO is Candidate for Mayor TOM HSIEH. On this issue they all agree.

On November 6, vote "L NO!" and SAVE CITY COLLEGE LAND — AGAIN.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Dave Wall, City College Physics Professor

Lou Batmale, City College Chancellor Emeritus

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The opponents argument against Proposition L is simply factually wrong. Proposition L will not harm City College and they know it.

FACT: In the months of public testimony over this rezoning before the Public Utilities Commission, the Planning Commission and the Board, no current official of City College testified against the rezoning nor raised any objection about the senior housing proposed for the site. No such official City College opposition exists.

FACT: The Phelan Loop has never been a part of a "West Campus" of City College. It has been owned by the PUC and used for a fire station and MUNI stop. Both uses will continue if L passes. The privately owned book store can also be accommodated in the 9,000 square feet of retail space in the senior housing development.

FACT: The 28 acres of Balboa Reservoir that City College has requested is in the process of being transferred to them by the PUC.

FACT: Both the old and the new City College Master Plan do not include the Phelan Loop site as it is not needed for the college's future expansion.

The simple truth is that the opponents of L are try to hold hostage critically needed senior housing to further some obscure private agenda. It's time to quit playing private politics with public land.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Nees: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.
Phelan Avenue Use

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Francisco has the highest percentage of seniors of any city in California with a population of over 100,000. Over half of these seniors are paying more than 50% of their income on housing. Senior homeowners cannot afford to make needed repairs on their homes and pay for other necessities. Senior renters are living in sub-standard conditions, unable to pay for adequate health care or food after rent.

A Yes Vote on L would allow for the construction of 120 units of affordable senior housing by a community based, non-profit housing development corporation. These units would give seniors living on fixed incomes the opportunity to live productive lives in a caring and supportive community — in units that are safe and affordable.

Show you care about the lives of San Francisco senior citizens. Vote Yes on L.

Erma Brim, SF Grey Panthers
George Twigg-Porter, Apostleship of Prayer
Clarissa Ward, SF Legislative Forum for Older Americans
Edward L. Peet, Ca. Legislative Council for Older Americans
Bruce McSpadden, SF United Methodist Mission
Geraldine Earp, Senior Action Network
Philip Klasky, Yerba Buena Consortium
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Robert Pender, Park Merced Residents Association
Rochelle Frazier, SF Business and Professional Women
William Price, Jr., Congress of California Seniors, RegII
Joe Lacey, Pres., TURN
Wendy Brown, San Francisco AIA
Sandi Peters, Catholic Committee on Aging
Kathleen Lammers, California Law Center on Long Term Care
Meg Doherty, SF Long Term Care Ombudsman Program
Frank Salt, California Senior Legislature
Howard Levy, Legal Assistance to the Elderly
Jane Holt, Central YMCA Senior Program
Annie Chung, Self Help for the Elderly
Leo McCarthy, Lt. Governor
Million Marks, State Senator
John Burton, State Assembly

As neighbors of the proposed senior housing on the Phelan Loop site, we urge you to vote YES on L.

The Phelan Loop site has been an eyesore in our neighborhood for too long! Everyone wins with the proposal for this site. Seniors get housing they can afford; MUNI drivers get new break and restrooms they need; City College gets a new pedestrian arcade and space for future expansion is preserved. The community will see an eyesore replaced with a well designed building anchoring the eastern end of the Ocean Avenue commercial strip serving as a gateway to our neighborhood.

Vote YES on L and support both our seniors and our neighborhood.

Ocean View-Merced-Ingleside
Community Association
Rev. Roland Gordon
L. Andrew Jeanpierre
Edward and Christina
McGovern
Claude and Zonobia
Everhardt
Bill Taylor
Linda Johnson
Bettye Simon
Nene and Marcelle
Henderson
Bob Landis

San Francisco needs permanently affordable senior rental housing. The proposed rezoning will allow the development of 120 such units along Ocean Avenue. It is supported by neighborhood merchants, community groups and senior organizations all across the City. As environmentalists, we strongly urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Ed Emerson, San Francisco
Tomorrow*
Andy Nash, SFT*
Tony Kilroy, SFT*
Peter Moylan, SFT*
Charlene Clark, SFT*
Bernie Choden, SFT*
Norman Rolfe, SFT*

*For ID purposes only

This is not the notorious Balboa Reservoir housing issue back on the ballot for the third time. We are transferring the reservoir to City College. This measure is about a different parcel of land. This “quarter acre” was never intended for City College use and Proposition L will allow us to build affordable housing for the elderly.

Please vote “yes”.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

A Yes vote on Proposition L is a YES for seniors, a YES for MUNI, a YES for City College, a YES for area merchants and a YES for the community. Proposition L will ensure that 120 units of permanently affordable senior rental housing will be built on a vacant eyesore known as Phelan Loop. It will also ensure that a new MUNI driver’s rest stop and a new bus stop will be constructed in the loop. It will provide for a pedestrian arcade for students walking to City College. It will also provide 9,300 s/f of neighborhood serving retail space, and will serve as a gateway to the Ocean Avenue commercial corridor and the community.

The building is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood with its 40 foot height limit. The proposed zoning — NC-2 — is the prevailing zoning on Ocean Avenue, and would complete the Ocean Avenue residential/commercial corridor to the east.

With over 50% of our City’s seniors paying over 50% of their income on housing, this housing is critically needed. Our seniors deserve to live in a safe, secure and friendly environment, in a home they can afford.

Vote YES for senior housing, Vote YES for MUNI, vote YES for City College, vote YES for neighborhood merchants, vote YES for the community. Vote YES on L.

Rev. John Lane, Co-Chair
Jim Feliciano, Co-Chair
Sue C. Hestor*, Tres., Phelan Loop Senior Housing Coalition

As church and community based non-profit affordable housing producers we strongly urge a Yes vote on Proposition L. Affordable senior housing is critically needed by our City’s 140,000 seniors, over 60% of whom are officially classified as either very low or low income residents. Rezoning this two acre parcel on Ocean Avenue will mean that 120 seniors will have an affordable and decent place to live.

Rene Cazenave, Council of Community Housing Organizations
Maryann Dillon, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Geraldine Johnson, SF Housing Development Corp.
Calvin Welch, Haight-Ashbury Community Development Corp.
Chuck Turner, Community Design Center
Gordon Chin, Chinese Community Housing Corporation
David Brigode, Community Housing Partnership
Randy Shaw, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Francis McKinney, San Francisco Housing Development Corp.
Mary lou Goeke, Catholic Charities
Kelly Cullen, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

A Yes vote on Proposition L would allow the rezoning of some two acres of land along Ocean Ave. for the purpose of developing 120 permanently affordable apartments for seniors and some 9,000 s/f of neighborhood serving retail space. Approval of this rezoning in no way prohibits the future expansion of City College. The site has only been used for a MUNI stop and that use will continue even after the senior housing is developed.

Our City is in critical need of housing able to be afforded by low income seniors. This development will meet that critical need and add to the neighborhood serving retail uses along Ocean Ave. Its height and density is in keeping with the existing character of the street. We strongly urge you to Vote Yes on Proposition L.

James B. Morales
Wayne Hu
Douglas Engmann
Susan J. Bierman
Edward C. Sewell

CITY COLLEGE DOESN’T NEED THE MUNI STATION AND WE DON’T NEED CITY COLLEGE

In the old days, people used to struggle to go to college, struggle to find a job, and struggle to find housing. City College was set up in the old days when San Franciscans thought people should struggle.

Now days, we have television so people don’t need to read and struggle for education. They don’t need to struggle to find a job or housing. Leaders like Art Agnos are showing the way so that people don’t have to struggle.

There is a lot of space at City College that could be better used for housing than for flowers, grass, and playing fields. These days, we have more relevant things to do with public land.

I not only urge you to vote YES, I urge the City to rezone most of the rest of the campus for affordable housing.

Lewis Epstein, Humanitarian
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

SAME OLD THING
This is the same old public land give-away you turned down three years ago and the year before that.
IGNORE CLAIMS OF “AFFORDABLE” HOUSING. As a realtor and retired Supervisor, I advise you it’s all HOGWASH.
The way it’s set up, most of the HOGS that would benefit would have MORE THAN AVERAGE INCOME.
Don’t let greedy developers take a big chunk of valuable City College campus.

John Barbagelata

Voters have TWICE AGREED WITH US that the acreage in question can best be used to RELIEVE THE OVERCROWDED CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS.
Nothing has changed.
Join us again by voting NO on L.

Lou Batmale, Chancellor Emeritus, City College

SAFETY
TWO STUDENTS A YEAR ARE KILLED on Ocean Avenue since streetcars stopped pulling into the CITY COLLEGE STATION.
Building apartments PREVENTS SOLUTIONS.
SAVE STUDENTS LIVES. Vote NO on L.

Dave Wall

EDUCATION is the biggest and most important investment we can make in our future. We should be adding space, classrooms and library shelves to CCSF.
STOP TAKING LAND FROM OUR COLLEGE.

Roger Olson

THE CAMPUS KEY
Agnos, after three elections to sell 12.6 ACRES of public land to a private developer for $36,900, still wants the key Ocean Avenue frontage, the transportation hub of the campus, for his developer friends.
L NO!

Dave Wall

Progressive San Franciscans will not allow so-called “affordable” housing to be played off against legitimately affordable education.
The costs of a college education are skyrocketing. Many more San Francisco students will be attending City College in the future, because it is excellent and affordable. But there are 28,000 students at crowded City College now, will there be facilities for them in the future?
NOT IF THE WEST CAMPUS IS SOLD A DEVELOPER. LABOR SAYS NO on L.
The future education of thousands of San Franciscans is at stake!

American Federation of Teachers — Local 2121 Committee on Political Education.
Mike Hulbert, President

OVERWHELMING NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION
Precincts next to the college have voted up to 95% against rezoning this land in THREE previous elections.
L NO! to rezoning.
HELP THE NEIGHBORHOOD HELP THE COLLEGE.

Ellen Wall, Sunnyside
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The fact that this issue even has to be on the ballot is an insult to the voters of San Francisco.

The public has determined three times not to rezone this piece of public property to allow developers to build housing in an already congested area, deciding instead to return the area to City College of San Francisco (the world's most populated community college), because it needs space.

Vote "NO" on Proposition L

In 1986, 1987 and 1988 the voters determined that City College's use of the property outweighed the benefits of developing the land.

Anyone who visits the area during the day knows the importance of the reservoir area to CCSF. CCSF provides San Franciscans of all socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds the opportunity to receive a college education. This unique educational policy has provided hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans the chance to succeed in today's competitive world. Its growing population has, however, been greeted with a shrinking campus.

The latest intrusion would create a huge private apartment building, approximately the size of the City College Science Building, directly across the street from the tiny campus. The building would provide 29 parking spaces for 120 units. Planners assert that 20,000 students a day would be funneled through a narrow tunnel in this private structure, downwind of diesel bus fumes, on their way to class. It doesn't take a Rhodes Scholar to realize City College needs the area for our children and grandchildren who strive mightily for education in a painful environment. Vote "NO" on Proposition L.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice-President Quentin L. Kopp

---

A federal audit discovered that 52 cents out of every taxpayer dollar HCDC, the Phelan Loop developer got went for "administration", not housing.

You pay for the proposed housing the developer will profit from, but You don't get preference.

Vote NO on Prop L— "Poverty Profiteering"

Peter Paul
Veritas Journal & Reform Government

---

TAKING CITY COLLEGE WITHOUT THE SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE IS NOT DEMOCRATIC. DON'T LET AGNOS AND HIS POLITICAL CRONIES GET AWAY WITH THIS ILL CONCEIVED LAND GRAB. NO-L-NO

Rich Bodisco
Chairman, S.F. Reasonable Reform
Rick Fenton
A Concerned Citizen

---

Beware of sly landlords and vindictive politicians who drive up rents and tax middle class voters to house the poor and elderly. A crowded, noisy campus is inappropriate for this undistinguished project. The City should prepare a comprehensive plan allowing for classroom and library expansion and more appropriate student-oriented housing.

The most affordable housing is existing affordable housing. Vacancy rent control must be preserved; evictions and unconscionable rent hikes stopped!

Don't be fooled by deceptive, big-money campaigns!
SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS FOR NO ON L AND YES ON M

Brian Doohan — SOMA
Barbara Meskunas — Western Addition
Joel Ventresca — Haight
Margaret Verges — Presidio
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ADOPTING CHANGES IN PROPERTY USE CLASSIFICATION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 11 PHELAN AVENUE, NORTHWEST CORNER AT OCEAN AVENUE, A PORTION OF LOT 1, ASSessor'S BLOCK 3180 FROM A P (PUBLIC USE) DISTRICT TO AN NC-2 (SMAll-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) DISTRICT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 101.1 OF THE PLANNING CODE.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to resolution of the Board of Supervisors, adopting the final negative declaration as its own, and pursuant to Section 302(c) of the City Planning Code, Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the following change in property use classification, duly approved by resolution of the City Planning Commission is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco.

Use District to be Superseded

Use District Herby Approved

NC-2

Description of Property

Beginning at the north end of the curve with a radius of 39.60 feet between the westerly line of Phelan Avenue and northerly line of Ocean Avenue as shown on Parcel 2 on Parcel Map of the Widening of Phelan and Ocean Avenues, filed February 15, 1954, in Map Book "R", page 56, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco; thence on said curve to the right, tangent to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue, with a radius of 39.60 feet through a central angle of 104°52'08"", an arc length of 72.48 feet to the northerly line of Ocean Avenue, as widened; thence along said northerly line tangent to the preceding curve 16.41 feet; thence deflecting to the right 76°36'57" 137.64 feet; thence deflecting to the left 92°32'39" 138.01 feet; thence deflecting to the left 88°56'26" 99.35 feet to a point on the northerly line of Ocean Avenue; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 104°52'08" 265.40 feet; thence deflecting to the right along said northerly line 0°26'4" 48.44 to the southeast corner of the parcel described in Deed from City and County of San Francisco to Safeway Stores Inc., a corporation, recorded June 2, 1954, in Book 6386, Page 412, Official Records; thence deflecting 90° to the right along the easterly line of said Safeway Stores parcel and its prolongation 171.18 feet; thence deflecting to the right 74°18'59" 378.28 feet; thence deflecting to the left 9°28'25" 81.04 feet to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue; thence deflecting to the right 99°51'14" along said westerly line 264.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; being a portion of Lot 1 in Assessor's Block 3180; and adjacent street areas to their centerline as designated on Sectional Map No. 12 of the Zoning Map.

Section 2. Pursuant to Section 101.1 of the Code, this Board of Supervisors adopts City Planning Commission Resolution No. 13042 approving findings related to the Eight Priority Policies of Section 101.1 of the Planning Code.
Vacancy Control

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City's rent control ordinance be amended to limit the amount a landlord may charge a new tenant to no more than 10% to 14% above the rent paid by the previous tenant, provided that the landlord could get additional increases if certain conditions are met?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City's rent control law, which went into effect June 13, 1979, limits rent increases for current tenants in certain residential units. Annual increases of between 4% and 7% are allowed, depending on increases in the cost of living. The law does not limit, however, the amount of rent a landlord may charge a new tenant after the current tenant moves out.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed a Vacancy Control Ordinance. For vacant units covered by rent control, this ordinance would limit rent increases for new tenants who move in on or after July 1, 1991. Before the ordinance took effect, a referendum petition was filed, requiring that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters approves.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would approve the Vacancy Control Ordinance. Under the ordinance, a landlord could charge a new tenant between 10% and 14% more than the rent paid by the last tenant, depending on how long the last tenant had lived in the unit. This increase would be allowed only once every three years. In addition, a landlord could charge allowable annual increases not charged to the last tenant back to June 13, 1979, when rent control went into effect. Landlords also could seek initial rents above this 10% to 14% limit if the last tenant moved in before June 13, 1979.

A landlord would have to give a new tenant a detailed written statement of how the allowable rent was determined. The tenant could have the Rent Board staff review the statement and approve the rent. If either the landlord or tenant did not agree with the result, either could use the existing appeals process.

Violations of the ordinance could result in the tenant recovering overpaid rent, plus punitive damages. It would be a misdemeanor to charge more than the allowable rent.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to go into effect.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance that limits rent increases on vacant units to be rejected.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

If the proposed measure is approved, in my opinion, there should be no effect on the cost of government.

How “M” Got on the Ballot

On August 2, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition M to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,798 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 9, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 30,502 of the signatures submitted were valid, 11,704 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Vacancy Control

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a fair compromise that protects tenants from completely unlimited rent increases and allows an increase equal to twice inflation or more for landlords who have acted fairly.

Proposition M will put an end to completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments. It will close the loophole in our Rent Law that has fueled the skyrocketing of rents to unreasonable levels.

Without vacancy control, there is a huge incentive to evict in order to get that unrestricted rent increase. And unfortunately some landlords respond to that incentive to evict, simply to hike up the rent. The elderly, the disabled, long term tenants, and lower income people are the victims.

Proposition M will replace these completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula based on the length of time the previous tenant lived there, how big the rent increases have been in the past, and increases in the landlords costs.

Landlords can raise the rent 10% on a vacant apartment if the previous tenant lived there five years or less, 12% if that previous tenant moved out after six years, and 14% if the tenant moved out after seven years or more.

The Fair Landlord provision of Proposition M protects landlords who have not raised their tenants' rent each year. When the tenant moves out the landlord may raise the rent on the vacant apartment to what the rent would have been if they had raised it each year. And that's in addition to the 10%, 12%, or 14% increase. Proposition M is essential to maintain affordable housing in San Francisco.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Hallinan, Maher, Shelley and Ward.
Noes: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh and Kennedy
Absent: Supervisors Britt and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vacancy Control is opposed by a broad cross-section of citizens from every community in our city.

Vacancy Control makes false promises.
Vacancy Control promises fewer evictions.

IN FACT, evictions have declined by 2/3rds in San Francisco between 1986 and 1991.

Vacancy Control promises affordable housing.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control in Berkeley and Santa Monica has led to a reduction in the supply of affordable rental units.

Vacancy Control advocates promise that the Rent Control bureaucracy will not grow larger and more expensive.

IN FACT, the rent control bureaucracies in Berkeley and Santa Monica have grown 10 times more expensive after Vacancy Control was implemented costing tenants millions more in higher rents and taxes.

Vacancy Control promises to lower rents.

IN FACT, tenants will be forced to pay higher rents when the costs of building improvements are added to monthly rent bills.

Vacancy Control promises a better city.

IN FACT, Vacancy Control will permanently damage our city.

Since 75% of the S.F. housing stock was built before 1940, improvements and repairs are necessary to keep rental units maintained. By writing a law which encourages owners not to improve their property, Vacancy Control will lead to declining neighborhoods and declining property values.

All bad laws begin with a false promise. Don’t be deceived by the many false promises of Vacancy Control.

NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar
Executive Director
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PROPOSITION M — VACANCY CONTROL WILL RAISE RENTS FOR TENANTS AND LOWER PROPERTY VALUES FOR HOMEOWNERS. VOTE NO ON M.

Vacancy control is a failed social experiment, imported from Berkeley and Santa Monica, that will create higher rents, deteriorating neighborhoods, a costly Rent Board bureaucracy, and lower property values in our city. San Francisco tenants and homeowners must not become Vacancy Control’s next victim.

RENTERS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.

By limiting increases on vacant units, Proposition M will give landlords incentive to raise rents beyond the 4% cap by passing through on monthly bills 1) improvements such as painting, a new roof, remodeling etc.; 2) increases in the operations and maintenance of your building; 3) utility rate increases, and; 4) increases of debt service for loans.

Also, your present $8.00 per year Rent Board tax will grow to over $100.00 when the Rent Board requires registration of units to police Vacancy Control. Vacancy Control removes incentives for apartment owners to maintain property — hurting poor renters first and leading to massive deterioration of rental property.

LONG TERM TENANTS ALERT! VOTE NO ON M.

PASSTHROUGH rent increases have occurred in only 15% of units. To benefit transient tenants, Vacancy Control will raise rents for stable tenants by giving landlords the incentive to implement PASSTROUGHS for every building and every unit.

VOTE NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

HOMEOWNERS BEWARE!

Proposition M creates a $10 million annual bureaucracy when vital services to our neighborhoods such as police, fire and libraries are being cut. Vacancy Control lowers home values by encouraging the spread of urban decay to every neighborhood in our city.

To many homeowners, a home represents life savings and secure retirement.

Home values must be protected.

NO ON M — NO ON VACANCY CONTROL.

Coalition For Better Housing

Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The opponents of Proposition M are the official lobbyists for the biggest landlords and real estate developers in the City.

They represent those interests well and we respect them for it.

But when they pretend to represent tenants and homeowners — well, it just isn’t believable. In fact, if they did that, they would not be doing the job they are paid to do.

The landlords and developers say Proposition M will raise rents. If this was true — why would they oppose it?

They are opposing Proposition M because it replaces completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments with a fair and flexible formula, using the existing system without cost to city government.

Under Proposition M, landlords could still raise rents by up to 14% on vacant apartments. That’s three times the rate of inflation. Rents could, under proposition M, be raised by even more if they haven’t been raised each year.

These are fair increases that protect renters and landlords.

The City Controller states that “Proposition M will have no effect on the cost of Government.”

The analysis by the impartial ballot simplification committee confirms that the “existing appeals process,” not registration, is used. There is no $10 Million bureaucracy.

Real estate and the city’s largest landlords don’t like Proposition M because it will treat both landlords and tenants fairly. They don’t like Proposition M because it will work.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Noes: Supervisor Hsieh.

Absent: Supervisor Britt.
PAY ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Limiting rent increases on vacant apartments is essential to preserving the affordable apartments we have left in our city. Without vacancy control, rents more than doubled during the 1980s. According to City Planning statistics, only 30% of our city’s households can now afford the price of a two-bedroom apartment.

Because of severe cutbacks in state and federal funding, the City cannot build affordable units fast enough to replace those lost due to rent increases. We risk losing affordable housing every time an apartment becomes vacant and the landlord is free to raise the rent without limit.

The legislation passed by the Board and signed by Mayor Agnos will not deprive any apartment owner of a fair return on his or her investment. It provides a mechanism for adjusting rents for good landlords who have raised the rent for many years and who might suffer if only allowed a flat percentage increase.

Proposition M helps protect all San Francisco residents. Please help save affordable housing by voting yes on Proposition M.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I have consistently supported vacancy control because it is needed to keep San Francisco affordable for people from all walks of life.

This vacancy control law is both fair and reasonable.

To save vacancy control, please join me in voting YES on Proposition M.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Candidate for Mayor

Completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments are just too big an incentive for many landlords to resist. Unfair evictions of long term and elderly tenants are the frequent result.

We know because we see it happening every day. Proposition M cuts this eviction incentive, allows reasonable increases, and uses the existing Rent Board system. Vote yes on M!

Polly Marshall, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Denise Stephenson, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Vivian Hammill, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner
Jake McGoldrick, San Francisco Rent Board Commissioner

San Francisco’s lesbian and gay community always has shown leadership on issues of fairness. That’s why all of our community’s elected officials fought so long and hard for the vacancy control law that is Proposition M.

Proposition M is fair to conscientious landlords who keep rents low for elderly, disabled or low-income tenants, it allows bonus rent increases on vacated apartments that have been kept below market rate.

Proposition M is fair to tenants because it ensures that San Francisco will have affordable, well-maintained apartments in the future.

Don’t believe the scare tactics of the real estate industry. Once again they’re raising the ridiculous argument that San Francisco will become a slum. The truth is, property values are skyrocketing, and nobody in their right mind is going to lose money in San Francisco real estate.

Resist the real estate industry’s expensive smokescreen campaign of deception and distortion. Stand up for a fair balance between the needs of landlords and tenants. Vote YES on M!

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

We as members of the Latino community in San Francisco support Proposition M, which will provide for control over the rents of vacant apartments.

The accelerated rise in rental housing prices over the last decade have made it increasingly difficult for working class Latino families to afford living in San Francisco. Proposition M will remove an important incentive for eviction of long term tenants, relieve overcrowding, and slow down the process of gentrification currently afflicting our neighborhoods.

Ruth Picon
Jose Medina
Maria Martinez
Commissioner Jim Morales
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The Justice and Peace Commission of the Archdiocese of San Francisco has been on record as supportive of some vacancy control measures since this legislation was introduced. I quote from the Catholic Bishops Pastoral: Economic Justice For All: "Economic decisions have human consequences and moral content; they help or hurt people, strengthen or weaken family life, advance or diminish the quality of justice in our land."

More and more people are not making it, especially families. They have a right to affordable housing. We believe that the present rent control law, while providing needed assistance to renters, does not go far enough. The lack of vacancy control provides a loo-p-hole that actually encourages some landlords, as I believe that most are honest, to encourage tenants to move out. As a result, the stock of rental units for low income people, and middle class people, continues to be depleted.

This is a fair ordinance, but, moreover, it is something we should do for the common good, for the good of the poorest among us, for the good of those families who want to live in the City and struggle to do so.

Justice and Peace Commission
Archdiocese of San Francisco

Proposition M is fair to landlords and provides needed protection for tenants. I know because I sponsored Prop. M only after an extensive series of meetings between landlords and tenants.

Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Proposition M would:

- Allow landlords 10%, 12%, or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there.
- Reward landlords who kept the rent low by allowing a further increase to recover past yearly increases they didn’t give.
- Let landlords who got caught with low rents when rent control first came in catch up.

And existing law already provides for:

- Annual increases pegged to inflation.
- Increases that cover the costs of work done on apartments.

Stop unfair and completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments! Vote yes on M.

Doris Ward
President, Board of Supervisors

Stop unlimited rent increases — Vote yes on M!

Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Community Tenants Association
David Spero
Richmond District Democratic Club

Don’t buy the developers bull!
They can raise the rent to cover inflation, the cost of any work they do to the apartment, and to cover any increase in operating or maintenance costs.

Instead of completely unlimited rent increases on vacant apartments, Prop. M would cap those increases to an amount equal to twice the rate of inflation.

If your salary or business’ income went up like that, you’d probably think it was more than fair.
But the big landlords and realtors aren’t satisfied, they want even more!
Tell the real estate lobby not to be so greedy. Tell them Prop M is fair. Vote yes on M!

Affordable Housing Alliance

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges you to VOTE YES on Prop. M.

Friendly pedestrian neighborhoods near jobs and markets get residents out of their cars. When high rents make neighborhoods less affordable, or tenants are threatened with evictions so rents can be raised, neighborhoods become less stable and friendly. People move to the suburbs where they drive three times as much, polluting the air and consuming more energy. This in turn fuels the arguments of the oil industry which wants to drill for oil in the Arctic and other pristine areas, and further threatens our coasts from tankers.

Keep San Francisco neighborhoods stable and friendly. VOTE YES ON PROP M.

League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Advocates for homeless people agree: homelessness is caused by San Francisco's high rents. The only longterm solution to homelessness is to give homeless people a chance to get off the streets and take control of their lives.

Prop M will enable homeless people to rent their own apartments by lowering the cost of moving in.

The Real Estate Lobby profits from high rents and homelessness by opposing Prop M, and spreads falsehoods which cloak their true responsibility for the human misery real estate speculation and rent-gouging have created.

HOMELESSNESS WILL ONLY BE SOLVED BY ENSURING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

YES ON M!

Coalition On Homelessness

Thousands of affordable apartments will be lost unless we vote yes on Proposition M.

Why? Because there are thousands of apartments that are affordable now, but when the current tenants move, the rent will go through the roof, thanks to the loophole in our Rent Law that allows unlimited rent increases.

Proposition M will fix this loophole and protect tenants and affordable housing. Instead of unlimited increases, landlords could get 10%, 12% or 14% increases on vacant apartments, depending on how long the previous tenant lived there. Landlords could get more if they had not raised the rent each year.

Proposition M is fair to landlords and will provide needed protection to tenants. Vote yes on M.

Assemblyman John Burton

46% of San Francisco renters pay more than 30% of their income in rent. For poor households, the percentage of income spent on rent is even higher — between 50% and 70%!* Don’t allow rents to get any higher! Keep vacancy control — Vote Yes on M!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s St. Peter’s Housing Committee

* according to Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1990

The San Francisco Tenants Union — the largest tenant counseling organization in the city — urges a YES vote on Proposition M.

San Francisco Tenants Union

Reasonable limits on rent increases will maintain affordability and protect the diversity San Francisco is famous for. Vote Yes on M!

San Francisco Tomorrow

This is a fair measure that was written during a three-year period of negotiations in which people on both sides made concessions. It fights hyper-inflated rent increases which continue to drive working and middle-class people out of San Francisco. Some landlords and realtors decided that if they couldn’t have it all their way, then they would agree to nothing — and spend one million dollars to see that tenants get nothing. Don’t be deceived by all their money. Proposition M will help keep San Francisco affordable. Please vote “yes”.

Mayor Art Agnos

Recently, I was contacted by a Marina resident who angrily recalled signing a petition “to reduce rents”. Deception and intimidation being the landlords’ and realtors’ strategy, it’s vital to know who’s behind the No on M campaign:

Clint Reilly unsatisfied with his millions from big insurance companies, wants one last killing before driving off into early retirement in his Yuppiesmobile...

Jack Davis squanders tenants' rent money on food fights in plush eateries with buddies like the Mitchell Brothers while the homeless and hungry press noses to the window in despair and disbelief.

And the landlords and realtors who hired them include condo conversion crook Bill Rosetti and Leona Helmsley.

Do you expect the truth from these vermin? Send them a message! VOTE YES!

Brian Doohan
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

In 1988 the Vacancy Control Campaign gathered over 100,000 votes in favor of a far stronger measure despite being outspent 40-1. Since opponents of Proposition M again have an overwhelming abundance of cash matched by their utter absence of integrity, it's important to remember some lowlights of 1988:

Shortly after extorting the support of apartment maintenance workers, the landlords mailed thousands of flyers featuring a corrupt building manager accepting a television for an apartment referral. That's how the landlords treat their friends!

Another piece of junk mail attempted to intimidate renters by bragging that landlords would raise rents through pass-throughs and let buildings fall into disrepair. Today, without vacancy control, the Department of Public Works has a backlog of over 700 buildings with life-threatening violations.

And after falsely claiming enforcement would cost $43,000,000 in 1988, the same landlords are using lack of registration as reason to vote against Proposition M.

Remember, every lying billboard, radio commercial or junk mailer against Proposition M was paid for by the rents of hard working San Franciscans who have enough trouble keeping a roof over their head.

Don't believe the landlords' bull! Vote YES.

The Vacancy Control Campaign

Proposition M was put on the ballot by landlords in an attempt to repeal the Board of Supervisors' recently-passed vacancy control measure.

We need stricter vacancy control, a rent freeze and a ban on evictions. Housing is a right!

Gloria Estela La Riva
Candidate for Mayor

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports vacancy control. We have fought for a measure like Proposition M for a decade. Without vacancy control, rents in vacant apartments have skyrocketed. This loophole in the City's rent control law also created an incentive for landlords to evict tenants.

Proposition M is a fair law to protect tenants and allow landlords a fair rate of return. The opponents of Proposition M who put this on the ballot are motivated by unlimited profit, not the well-being of tenants.

Rents in San Francisco are already too high. Let's put a lid on unlimited rent increases!

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco County Democratic Party

Connie O'Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Adrian Bermudez, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Catherine J. Dodd, RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Shirley B. Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco cannot afford the Proposition M vacancy control scheme.
Not only is vacancy control a proven failed housing policy, it will harm our city's economy, cost millions in lost revenue, and result in reduced services.
In other cities, vacancy control has failed to achieve its promised benefits, destroying rental housing, ruining neighborhoods and discouraging investment in housing. Do not burden San Francisco with another destructive ordinance.
Keep San Francisco's economy strong.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

History shows that every city that has tried vacancy control has ended up with more housing problems. Berkeley has lost over 13% of its rental housing since it enacted vacancy control. Thirteen percent of the San Francisco rental housing supply is 26,000 units. Tenants and the city would be in terrible shape if San Francisco repeated the Berkeley experience and thereby lost 26,000 rent units.
VOTE NO on Proposition M.

Honorable James Fang, BART Board Member
Honorable Michael Bernick, BART Board Member
Honorable Chuck Ayala, Community College Board

Once again the city's electorate is being asked to vote on vacancy control. Three times the voters have voted it down, but here we are again!
Under the best of circumstances administering vacancy control will cost between $15-20 million.
Doesn't the city have enough demands on its revenue sources? Many of our existing programs are in need of funding — why then build yet another bureaucracy?
VOTE NO on Prop. M.

Bob Ross, Publisher
BAR (Bay Area Reporter)

If vacancy control passes, it would be a devastating blow to the construction industry which employs about 25,000 people.
As the incentive for property owners to fix up their buildings is eliminated, the erosion of badly needed jobs will be quickly realized. WHO NEEDS VACANCY CONTROL?
VOTE NO!

Joe O'Donoghue, President
Residential Builders Association

Funding for AIDS not bureaucracy!
Vote No on vacancy control.

Ray Chalker, Publisher
The Sentinel

We strongly encourage you to vote No on Proposition M.
Vacancy control is harmful to the interests of renters, home and apartment owners. It can cause decay in our neighborhoods.
Vacancy control has had negative impacts in the other California cities. Don't let it harm San Francisco.
Please Join us in voting No on Vacancy control.

Bok F. Pon, Executive Director
Chinese American Outreach Program
Bill Chin, Former Chairman of Chinese Consolidate Assn.
Stephen Quan, Chairman of Hoy Ping Assn.
Kwok Ying Tang
Thomas H. Gee
Timothy H. Lau

As the former Assessor and Controller of San Francisco, we can assure you that vacancy control will reduce the amount of property taxes collected from rental property. San Francisco cannot afford a reduction in tax revenues. We urge you to vote NO on Prop. M.

Samuel Duca, Former Assessor
John C. Farrell, Controller,
City and County of San Francisco, Retired
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco does not need vacancy control. Market forces have kept rent increases for vacant apartments well below the inflation rate for over 5 years. There are thousands of vacant apartments in a broad price range available here for renters to choose from. Just check the Sunday papers.

We have served on the San Francisco Rent Stabilization Board for many years now and have observed a steady decrease in owners applying to impose pass-through rent increases. Renter complaints alleging unfair practices, such as decreased services or wrongful eviction, have also declined dramatically in recent years. Our current reasonable law has worked to stabilize rents and to bring some peace to rental housing relations in our city. Vacancy control will reverse that positive trend.

Currently, renters in San Francisco pay no more than $8 per year to operate our Rent Board. With vacancy control, rent board administrative costs will increase if Berkeley and Santa Monica can be used as examples. Renters in Berkeley and Santa Monica pay from $132 to $136 per year per apartment to pay for vacancy control. Few renters in Berkeley or Santa Monica will ever benefit from vacancy control. You won’t benefit from it in San Francisco either. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Rent Board Commissioners:
Tim Carrico
Mamie How

Alternate Rent Board Commissioners:
Mike Rossoff
Bill Villa

As former city commissioners, we know that vacancy control is not part of a sound housing plan. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Nancy Lenvin, Former Pres, Public Utilities Commission
Preston Cook, Former Housing Authority Commissioner
Bruce Lilenthal, Founding Pres,
S.F. Small Business Advisory Commission

As Chair of the Board of Supervisors’ Finance Committee I demanded an economic impact report of vacancy control prior to the Board’s vote. I regret that this evaluation was not done.

The evidence from other cities strongly supports my belief that vacancy control will result in property owners seeking reassessments from the Assessor for their apartment buildings. Lower tax revenues mean a weak tax base and less resources to carry out vital city and human services.

Proposition M is fiscally irresponsible. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

As former supervisor I supported the current law.
I would vote again for the rent control ordinance, since it protects tenants-in-place. But would never support vacancy control. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Gordon Lau, Former Supervisor

Vacancy control does nothing to help low-income rental households. What we need is an earmarked fund that we can use to target subsidies for those who need them. Vacancy control, all too often, subsidizes new, upper income households that do not need assistance.

Additionally, vacancy control discourages the investment of small property ownership. We don’t want this city’s housing stock owned by only large investors.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie B. Kennedy, Member,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco cannot afford the Proposition M vacancy control scheme.
Not only is vacancy control a proven failed housing policy, it will harm our city's economy, cost millions in lost revenue, and result in reduced services.
In other cities, vacancy control has failed to achieve its promised benefits, destroying rental housing, ruining neighborhoods and discouraging investment in housing. Do not burden San Francisco with another destructive ordinance.
Keep San Francisco's economy strong.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

History shows that every city that has tried vacancy control has ended up with more housing problems. Berkeley has lost over 13% of its rental housing since it enacted vacancy control. Thirteen percent of the San Francisco rental housing supply is 26,000 units. Tenants and the city would be in terrible shape if San Francisco repeated the Berkeley experience and thereby lost 26,000 rent units.
VOTE NO on Proposition M.

Honorable James Fang, BART Board Member
Honorable Michael Bernick, BART Board Member
Honorable Chuck Ayala, Community College Board

Once again the city's electorate is being asked to vote on vacancy control. Three times the voters have voted it down, but here we are again!
Under the best of circumstances administering vacancy control will cost between $15-20 million.
Doesn't the city have enough demands on its revenue sources? Many of our existing programs are in need of funding — why then build yet another bureaucracy?
VOTE NO on Prop. M.

Bob Ross, Publisher
BAR (Bay Area Reporter)

If vacancy control passes, it would be a devastating blow to the construction industry which employs about 25,000 people.
As the incentive for property owners to fix up their buildings is eliminated, the erosion of badly needed jobs will be quickly realized. WHO NEEDS VACANCY CONTROL?
VOTE NO!

Joe O'Donoghue, President
Residential Builders Association

Funding for AIDS not bureaucracy!
Vote No on vacancy control.

Ray Chalker, Publisher
The Sentinel

We strongly encourage you to vote No on Proposition M. Vacancy control is harmful to the interests of renters, home and apartment owners. It can cause decay in our neighborhoods. Vacancy control has had negative impacts in the other California cities. Don't let it harm San Francisco.
Please Join us in voting No on Vacancy control.

Bok F. Pon, Executive Director
Chinese American Outreach Program
Bill Chin, Former Chairman of Chinese Consolidate Assn.
Stephen Quan, Chairman of Hoy Ping Assn.
Kwok Ying Tang
Thomas H. Gee
Timothy H. Lau

As the former Assessor and Controller of San Francisco, we can assure you that vacancy control will reduce the amount of property taxes collected from rental property. San Francisco cannot afford a reduction in tax revenues. We urge you to vote NO on Prop. M.

Samuel Duca, Former Assessor
John C. Farrell, Controller,
City and County of San Francisco, Retired

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

San Francisco does not need vacancy control. Market forces have kept rent increases for vacant apartments well below the inflation rate for over 5 years. There are thousands of vacant apartments in a broad price range available here for renters to choose from. Just check the Sunday papers. We have served on the San Francisco Rent Stabilization Board for many years now and have observed a steady decrease in owners applying to impose pass-through rent increases. Renter complaints alleging unfair practices, such as decreased services or wrongful eviction, have also declined dramatically in recent years. Our current reasonable law has worked to stabilize rents and to bring some peace to rental housing relations in our city. Vacancy control will reverse that positive trend.

Currently, renters in San Francisco pay no more than $8 per year to operate our Rent Board. With vacancy control, rent board administrative costs will increase if Berkeley and Santa Monica can be used as examples. Renters in Berkeley and Santa Monica pay from $132 to $136 per year per apartment to pay for vacancy control. Few renters in Berkeley or Santa Monica will ever benefit from vacancy control. You won’t benefit from it in San Francisco either. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Rent Board Commissioners:
Tim Carrico
Mamie How

Alternate Rent Board Commissioners:
Mike Rossoff
Bill Villa

As former city commissioners, we know that vacancy control is not part of a sound housing plan. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Nancy Lenzin, Former Pres, Public Utilities Commission
Preston Cook, Former Housing Authority Commissioner
Bruce Lilienthal, Founding Pres,
S.F. Small Business Advisory Commission

As Chair of the Board of Supervisors’ Finance Committee I demanded an economic impact report of vacancy control prior to the Board’s vote. I regret that this evaluation was not done.

The evidence from other cities strongly supports my belief that vacancy control will result in property owners seeking reassessments from the Assessor for their apartment buildings. Lower tax revenues mean a weak tax base and less resources to carry out vital city and human services.

Proposition M is fiscally irresponsible. VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

As former supervisor I supported the current law. I would vote again for the rent control ordinance, since it protects tenants-in-place. But would never support vacancy control. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Gordon Lau, Former Supervisor

Vacancy control does nothing to help low-income rental households. What we need is an earmarked fund that we can use to target subsidies for those who need them. Vacancy control, all too often, subsidizes new, upper income households that do not need assistance. Additionally, vacancy control discourages the investment of small property ownership. We don’t want this city’s housing stock owned by only large investors.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie B. Kennedy, Member,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a POOR EXCUSE FOR A HOUSING POLICY. What San Francisco needs is a realistic, economically viable, socially progressive housing policy and this is not it!

Who wins under this new scenario? High-income wage-earners, who do not need this assistance, have their rents held in check while lower-income folks trying to get into the market are held back due to the increased competition for below-market values.

Not one cent should be wasted on such an undirected program. Help those who need help and keep effective incentives in place — we need rent control, but not vacancy control.

VOTE NO ON THIS MEASURE.

Joy Hahn
San Francisco Tenant

As property managers, we are the beneficiaries of this legislation since we would choose the tenants for the below-market rental units. Yet we remain strongly opposed:

Vacancy Control (VC) removes the last remaining market incentive for an owner to do a good job of taking care of their buildings. This policy encourages deterioration of our famed San Francisco housing stock as well as removes apartments from the available supply.

VC IS UNFAIR TO IN-PLACE TENANTS. New tenants could pay less than long-standing residents. Plus long-standing tenants could expect greater annual rent increases than their new better-off yuppie neighbors. Does this make sense? The ever-growing bureaucracy is the only winner with VC.

VC ENCOURAGES DISCRIMINATION against newcomers and low-income renters. Just try renting in Berkeley as a newcomer if you doubt this fact.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TOO IMPORTANT for us to continue to expend so much negative energy fighting about a stupid yuppie housing subsidy like VC. Let's move ahead not backwards on affordable housing. Let's work together to build affordable housing. Please, let's vote No on M to stop Vacancy Control.

Chris Collins, Vice President
Jeanne Armstrong, 1990 President
Professional Property Management Association of San Francisco

I urge you to vote no on Proposition M. It is clear that those who support vacancy control have failed to consider its harmful effects on both renters and our City. We must implement housing programs that will encourage and provide low and moderate income housing, not discourage and stop it. We must encourage programs that will upgrade and repair existing rental housing as well as providing solutions to the earthquake dangers in unreinforced masonry buildings. We cannot afford to experiment with a program that promises improvements, but has failed to provide them in every city in which it has been tried.

Vote NO on Proposition M. Thank you.

John L. Molinaro, Former President and Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Controls do not work. Rental controls on vacant housing have been disastrous in New York. The San Francisco Council of District Merchants’ Associations represents over 2000 businesses in the neighborhoods of the city.

We oppose vacancy control. Vote No on Proposition M.

Harold M. Hoogasian, President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants’ Associations

Our existing rent ordinance was designed to protect tenants in place by limiting annual rent increases. It has served our city well over more than a decade and shouldn’t be changed.

This is one of the most confusing ordinances I have seen in my many years in public office. Try reading it yourself! Its implementation will create an enormous bureaucracy which San Francisco can ill-afford.

What San Francisco needs is the creation of a sound housing policy which will meet the needs of our very diverse city.

Let’s stop building more bureaucracy.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.,
Speaker of the Assembly
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We are AIDS activists opposing Proposition M.

Let's look at the facts.

One percent of San Francisco's population has died from AIDS. Another four percent is infected. San Franciscans become infected every day. While the City's response has been admirable, more money is needed.

Each year we are told there is insufficient money to fully fund vital AIDS services such as early intervention treatment and new education efforts for at-risk populations.

Vacancy control regulates rents on empty apartments, but is expensive to administer. Our current rent ordinance is funded by an $8 per unit fee (paid by renters). This will increase dramatically. The cost in California cities which have vacancy control is approximately $136 per unit. For San Francisco that amounts to over $27 million.

New laws for new bureaucracies can hardly be called progressive when implemented at the expense of AIDS funding.

Our tax money should be used to save as many lives as possible, not to regulate rents on the empty apartments of our dead friends!!

Vote NO on Proposition M!

Peter N. Fowler
Jessie Dobson
Michael Rossoff
Gordon P. Crespo
David E. Bell
Michael C. Hall

Don't be misled by a few gay and lesbian politicos who support this radical vacancy control measure. They don't speak for our entire community.

We know that vacancy control reduces the quality of rental housing and leads to the loss of units. Many existing tenants will be faced with higher rents.

Most importantly, vacancy control reduces revenues from rental property which is needed to fund vital community services.

Join us in voting NO on Prop. M.

Log Cabin Club
Robert Speer, President

Vacancy Control is a bad idea.

It hurts the poor. Destroys neighborhoods. And costs too much. It's failed in every city where it's been implemented. Berkeley and Santa Monica have vacancy control and have lost minority populations at a much greater rate than other California cities. When artificially capped rents stimulate demand, who gets the apartments? The wealthy, not the poor.

While San Francisco added thousands of rental units under the previous mayor, Berkeley and Santa Monica each lost thousands of units. Owners went out of business because they were losing money. Builders stopped building because they couldn't recapture costs. The eroded tax base now provides less money for essential services.

We can't afford vacancy control. Its administration will cost millions. Proponents' claims to the contrary are false. Santa Monica's original rent board budget was a few hundred thousand. Now it's $4.6 million. Berkeley's is $2.2 million.

San Francisco's rent board is financed by an $8 per unit fee (renters pay this either directly or it's included in their rent). Berkeley's unit tax began at $12 per unit. With vacancy control it's now $136. For San Francisco's approximately 200,000 units, that amounts to $27.2 million.

San Francisco renters are smarter than the politicians think, and would prefer spending their money wisely. Like providing AIDS services, helping the homeless, or cleaning our streets -- not building bureaucracy, ruining our housing, and displacing minorities.

Voters have repeatedly rejected vacancy control. We're tired of the games.

Stop the madness!

Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Apartment Association
Committee to Preserve Rental Housing
Joseph K. Bravo, President

Rent control, as it exists now, works well for the tenants of this city. Anything more stringent would be a disincentive to the creation of more housing -- something we are in desperate need of.

VOTE NO ON PROP M.

Jane Winslow
Community Activist
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Vacancy control is a flawed policy. It discourages landlords from maintaining buildings. It encourages tenants who are moving out to sell their leases to the highest bidder, not to the needy. And studies show that it gentrifies neighborhoods, not the other way around.

I have supported reasonable rent control. Under the current law, San Francisco rents have stabilized or have dropped due to market pressures.

More restrictive vacancy control doesn’t help low income renters because it creates an expensive new bureaucracy, paid for by renters. In San Francisco, the annual tax on renters to feed this bureaucracy could exceed $150. Current tenants would not benefit.

The history of vacancy control is a failed social and housing policy. It often subsidized the rich while it hurts lower income and minority families. It is a cruel hoax. Let’s not repeat that mistake in San Francisco.

Please join me in voting No on Proposition M.

Supervisor Bill Maher

Jobs are the lifeline that separate one from the ability to pay rent, meet one’s mortgage obligation or become homeless.

In the last few years, this city has witnessed an unbelievable erosion of job opportunities. Not just for construction workers, but at all levels of the job market.

This is the resultant of neanderthal governmental regulations.

The enactment of vacancy control will assure fewer jobs in all areas of the housing industry.

Vote NO on Prop. M.

Larry Mazzola, Bus. Mgr. & Fin. Secty - Treas.
Local Union No. 38
Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry

Small Business has frequently been cited as the cornerstone of the San Francisco economy. We work here and we live here. We are opposed to vacancy control because we know it will have an adverse effect in the creation of housing for our customers and our employees.

* We urge you to vote No on Proposition M.

Andrew R. Ebron, Vice President
Small Business Network

The full burden of vacancy control will fall on small and new property owners, many of whom are and will be Asian American, unable to afford the professional staff that will be required to deal with the complex and constantly changing rules and regulations. It is the small community property home-owner which will suffer. Moreover, there is no evidence that cities with vacancy control have been able to improve or house low income or minority households. Vacancy control is a detriment to our community’s desire to fully contribute to American society.

James Fang, Executive Director,
Asian American Voter Project

As most of the world embraces free market economic policies, City Hall persists with unnecessary regulatory infringement on the rights of San Francisco property owners. We Republicans favor the retention of a free market for rental housing as a productive means to ensure affordable housing for all San Francisco residents. Therefore, we strongly oppose the addition of a vacancy control amendment to the existing rent ordinance.

Stringent vacancy control ordinances in other jurisdictions have led to the loss of rental units, deterioration of apartment buildings and the surrounding neighborhoods, weakened economic and fiscal health of the community, discrimination against low and moderate income and minority families, harm to the environment, and unfair infringement on the rights of rental property owners to earn a reasonable return on investment.

For those who wish to restore fiscal integrity and a robust economy to our City, the choice is easy.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
L. Kirk Miller, Chair
Sam T. Harper
James E. Gilleran
Cristina I. Mack
Christopher L. Bowman
Mark D. Hill
Bok F. Pon

Jun R. Hataoyama
K. Martin Keller
Albert C. Chang
Pablo Wong
Stephen D. Mayer
Joanne S. Stevens
Arthur Bruzzone
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Vacancy control (Proposition M on the Ballot) is an ineffective housing policy by any perspective. There are compelling arguments why it should be rejected.

- Vacancy control does not preserve housing for low- and moderate-income families. In communities with vacancy control, poor families are at a substantial disadvantage. By restricting rent levels, vacancy control forces housing providers to turn to other factors, such as income and credit worthiness, to choose among prospective tenants.
- By reducing the return on investment, vacancy control will lead to marked reductions in expenditures for building maintenance and repair. Over time, these reduced expenditures will take their toll on rental properties and the quality of housing services provided to tenants.
- Vacancy control will destroy the incentive for developers to build new rental units in San Francisco. Although San Francisco exempts new units from rent control, developers generally do not believe that communities which adopt stringent forms of rent control will refrain from eventually putting new units under controls, as New York City did. Hence, San Francisco’s housing shortage will get worse.
- The drop in real estate values brought about by vacancy control will lead to an erosion of San Francisco’s property tax base.

Vacancy control does not result in long term benefits for either tenants or the community.

Vote NO on Proposition M.

San Francisco Association of Realtors
Helen Dawson, President

We strongly encourage San Franciscans to reject vacancy control by voting No on Proposition M.

Vacancy Control is harmful to the long-term ability of San Francisco to solve its pressing housing, social and financial problems. We need practical and effective solutions. Proposition M will create new problems. It will not solve our city’s existing problems.

We should be investing in our city’s future not voting for propositions that drag it down.

Thank you for joining us in voting No on Proposition M.

Allen Okamoto
Florence Fang
Jackson Wong
Yvonne Lee
John Fang
Ivan Wong
Anton Qui
Peter Yu
Pablo Wong

Homeowners Beware!

Passage of Proposition M will lead to the deterioration of San Francisco’s neighborhoods. It will also result in a reduction in property values. Vacancy control has had these effects in other cities.

Don’t be fooled into voting for vacancy control because you believe it will help renters. Evidence from other communities shows that it harms low-income and minority families, leads to poorer apartment quality and increases rents for current tenants.

Vacancy control will reduce taxes from apartments, resulting in fewer services for our neighborhoods and, possibly, increased taxes and fees for homeowners.

Please join us in voting No on Proposition M.

San Francisco Homeowners’ Council
Tim Carrico, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION M

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A AND 37.11A THEREOF, TO ESTABLISH LIMITATIONS ON INITIAL RENTS FOR RENTAL UNITS, CREATE A PROCEDURE FOR VERIFICATION OF INITIAL RENTS, PROVIDE FOR ARBITRATION OF INITIAL RENTS, EXPAND FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED BY HEARING OFFICERS, CREATE A NEW CRIMINAL PENALTY AND ENLARGE THE SCOPE OF CIVIL ACTIONS.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Sections 37.3, 37.7, 37.8, 37.10A and 37.11A thereof to read as follows:

Sec. 37.3. Rent Limitations.

(a) Rent Increase Limitations for Tenants in Occupancy. Landlords may impose rent increases upon tenants in occupancy only as provided below:

(1) Annual Rent Increase. On March 1 of each year, the Board shall publish the increase in the CPI for the preceding 12 months, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor. A landlord may impose an annual rent increase which does not exceed a tenant's base rent by more than 60% of said published increase. In no event, however, shall the allowable annual increase be less than 4% or greater than 7%.

(2) Banking. A landlord who refrains from imposing an annual rent increase or any portion thereof may accumulate said increase and impose that amount on the tenant's subsequent rent increase anniversary dates. A landlord who, between April 1, 1982 and February 29, 1984, has banked an annual 7% rent increase (or rent increases) or any portion thereof may impose the accumulated increase on the tenant's subsequent rent increase anniversary dates.

(b) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may impose rent increases based upon the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation or energy conservation measures provided that such costs are certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(c) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(c) above.

(d) Charges Related to Excess Water Use. A landlord may impose increases not to exceed fifty percent of the excess use charges (penalties) levied by the San Francisco Water Department on a building for use of water in excess of Water Department allocations under the following conditions:

(A) The landlord provides tenants with written certification that the following have been installed in all units: (1) permanently-installed retrofit devices designed to reduce the amount of water used per flush or low-flow toilets (1.6 gallons per flush); (2) low-flow shower heads which use no more than 2.5 gallons per minute; and (3) faucet aerators (where installation on current faucets is physically feasible); and

(B) The landlord provides the tenants with written certification that no known plumbing leaks currently exist in the building and that any leaks reported by tenants in the future will be promptly repaired; and

(C) The landlord provides the tenants with a copy of the water bill for the period in which the penalty was charged. Only penalties billed for a service period which begins after the effective date of the ordinance may be passed through to tenants. Where penalties result from an allocation which does not reflect documented changes in occupancy which occurred after March 1, 1991, a landlord must, if requested in writing by a tenant, make a good faith effort to appeal the allotment. Increases based upon penalties shall be pro-rated on a per room basis provided that the tenancy existed during the time the penalty charges accrued. Such charges shall not become part of a tenant's base rent. Where a penalty in any given billing period reflects a 25% or more increase in consumption over the prior billing period, and where that increase does not appear to result from increased occupancy or any other known use, a landlord may not impose any increase based upon such penalty unless inspection by a licensed plumber or Water Department inspector fails to reveal a plumbing or other leak. If the inspection does reveal a leak, no increase based upon penalties may be imposed at any time for the period of the un repaired leak.

(e) RAP Loans. A landlord may impose rent increases attributable to the Chief Administrative Officer's amortization of the RAP loan in an area designated on or after July 1, 1977 pursuant to Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(f) Additional Increases. A landlord who seeks to impose any rent increase which exceeds those permitted above shall petition for a rental arbitration hearing pursuant to Section 37.8 of this chapter.

(g) Limitation on All Increases. Notwithstanding any other provision of Section 37.3, where a hearing officer, pursuant to Section 37.8(c)(7), has ordered that a tenant receive no increases because the landlord has failed to substantiate the initial rent, the increases set forth in Section 37.3(a)(1-4) shall not be allowed.

(h) Notice of Rent Increase for Tenants in Occupancy. On or before the date upon which a landlord gives a tenant legal notice of a rent increase, the landlord shall inform the tenant, in writing, of the following:

(1) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the annual increase, and/or a banked amount, if any;

(2) Which portion of the rent increase reflects costs for capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures certified pursuant to Section 37.7;

(3) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the pass through of charges for gas and electricity, which charges shall be explained;

(4) Which portion of the rent increase reflects the amortization of the RAP loan, as described in Section 37.3(a)(6) above.

(i) Nonconforming Rent Increases. Any rent increase which does not conform with the provisions of this section shall be null and void.

(c) Initial Rent Limitation for Subtenants. A tenant who subleases his or her rental unit may charge no more rent upon initial occupancy of the subtenant or subtenants than that rent which the tenant is currently paying to the landlord.

(d) Establishment of Initial Rents.

(1) For tenants occupying a rental unit pursuant to a tenancy which begins on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge no more than the base rent of the previous tenancy plus the amounts listed below, as applicable:

(A) Vacancy Allowance. A landlord may charge an additional 2% per year over the base rent of the previous tenancy provided that the calculation of such figure begins on or after April 1, 1982. In no event, however, shall the vacancy allowance be less than 10% or more than 14%. In addition, this allowance shall not be imposed unless the previous tenancy was terminated either voluntarily by the tenant or pursuant to a lawful eviction under Section 37.9(a) below. This allowance shall also not be imposed more than once in any given 36-month period beginning on or after July 1, 1991.

(B) Banking:

(i) A landlord may charge any amounts which the landlord has banked with respect to the previous tenancy pursuant to Section 37.3(a)(2).

(ii) A landlord may also charge any annual rent increases which the landlord could lawfully have imposed with respect to the previous tenancy between June 13, 1979 and March 31, 1982 but refrained from imposing, provided that such increases do not exceed 7% per year for this period.

(C) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation, and Energy Conservation Measures. A landlord may charge for capital improvements or rehabilitation or energy conservation measures which have been certified pursuant to Section 37.7 below.

(D) Utilities. A landlord may impose increases based upon the cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(c) above.

(E) Fair Landlord Adjustments.

(i) CPI Adjustment. Where a pre-June 13, 1979 tenancy terminates on or after July 1, 1991, a landlord may charge an amount equivalent to 60% of the annual increase in the Consumer Price Index, as made available by the U.S. Department of Labor, for each year prior to June 13, 1979, provided that such increases were not imposed during this pe-
riod. This adjustment shall be calculated prior to all other calculations of increases and allowances permitted under Section 37.3(d).

(ii) Fair Market Adjustment. As an alternative to the CPI adjustment permitted in subsection (i) above, a landlord may petition the Board for a hearing to determine the fair market value of the unit on June 13, 1979 where the landlord claims that the rent charged on that date was less than market rent for comparable units and where the pre-June 13, 1979 tenancy terminates on or after July 1, 1991. Evidence shall include, but not be limited to, rents as advertised for that neighborhood in the local newspaper during the week of June 13, 1979, which advertisements shall be available at the Board. This adjustment is only available if a similar adjustment for the unit has not been granted by the Board under Section 37.8(b)(4)(B).

(2) The purpose of subsections (d)(1)(E) above is to assure that landlords who have had long-term tenants with historically low rents pre-dating June 13, 1979 receive fair rents upon the first new tenancy commencing on or after July 1, 1991, the date upon which this Chapter first established limitations on initial rents.

(3) Notwithstanding the limits on the establishment of Initial rents set forth in subsection (d)(1) above, where a unit is not subject to this Chapter on July 1, 1991 subsequently becomes subject to this Chapter, there shall be no limit on the initial rent charged.

(4) The limits on the establishment of Initial rents set forth in subsection (d)(1) above shall not apply to units vacated and re-rented pursuant to Sections 37.9(a)(13) and 37.9A.

(5) Nothing in the establishment of Initial rents shall prohibit a landlord from seeking other increases permissible under this Chapter.

(c) Landlord Disclosure of Allowable Initial Rents.

(1) For each rental unit offered for rent where a new tenancy is to begin on or after July 1, 1991, the landlord shall provide each prospective tenant with a written rent disclosure statement. The statement, which shall be signed and dated by the landlord under penalty of perjury, shall include the following separately stated, as applicable:

(A) Previous Rent. The base rent of the previous tenancy.

(B) Vacancy Allowance. Any increase permitted by Section 37.2(d)(1)(A) above.

(C) Banking. Any amount which the landlord has banked with respect to the previous tenancy pursuant to Section 37.3(d)(1)(B) above.

(D) Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation and Energy Conservation Measures. Amounts for such work which have been certified pursuant to Section 37.7 plus those amounts for which the landlord has filed a petition with the Board. The landlord shall include any Board decision under which the landlord received authorization for such pass-throughs, plus any petition for future pass-throughs filed with the Board.

(E) Utilities. Amounts for the increased cost of utilities as provided in Section 37.2(o) above.

(F) CPI Adjustment. Any CPI adjustment increases permitted under Section 37.3(d)(1)(E)(i) above, if a landlord chooses this alternative.

(G) Total Rent. The above items shall be totaled. This total is the allowable rent for any tenancy which begins on or after July 1, 1991; provided, however, that any amount which reflects capital improvements not yet certified by the Board is subject to change upon certification.

(h) Fair Market Adjustment. If a landlord chooses this adjustment as an alternative to the CPI adjustment in (f) above, the landlord shall state that he/she seeks this adjustment and shall file a petition with the Board no later than 240 days after the commencement of the tenancy. This time limit is mandatory and therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(i) Rent Board Information. The disclosure shall also include a statement that information concerning rents which may be lawfully charged in San Francisco is available from the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board.

(j) Verification. The disclosure shall also include a statement that the tenant may seek verification of any information contained in the rent disclosure statement from the Rent Board. Such verification must be sought no later than 240 days after the commencement of the tenancy. This time limit is mandatory and is therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(k) Failure to provide the information required in the rent disclosure statement shall subject the landlord to the penalties set forth in this Chapter.

(l) Review of Rent Limitations upon Initial Occupancy. The limitations upon the establishment of Initial rents as set forth in Section 37.3(d) above shall be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors prior to July 1, 1993 and adjusted, if necessary, in order to continue to assure landlords fair and reasonable rents. If the Board fails to review the limitations on Initial rents prior to July 1, 1993, the limitation shall expire on said date.

Sec. 37.7. Certification of Rental Increases for Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation and Energy Conservation Measures.

(a) Authority. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to conduct hearings in order to certify rental increases to the extent necessary to amortize the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures. Costs determined to be attributable to such work shall be amortized over a period which is fair and reasonable for the type and the extent of the work and which will provide an incentive to landlords to maintain, improve and renovate their properties while at the same time protecting tenants from excessive rent increases. Costs attributable to routine repair and maintenance shall not be certified.

(b) Requirements for Certification. The Board and designated hearing officers may only certify the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures where the following criteria are met:

(1) The landlord completed capital improvements or rehabilitation on or after April 15, 1979, or the landlord completed installation of energy conservation measures on or after July 24, 1982 and has filed a proof of compliance with the Bureau of Building Inspection in accordance with the requirements of Section 1207(d) of the Housing Code;

(2) The landlord has not yet increased the rent or rents to reflect the cost of said work;

(3) The landlord has not been compensated for the work by insurance proceeds;

(4) The building is not subject to a RAP loan in a RAP area designated prior to July 1, 1977.

(c) Amortization and Cost Allocation. The Board shall establish amortization periods and cost allocation formulas. Costs shall be allocated to each unit according to the benefit of the work attributable to such unit.

(d) Estimator. The Board or its Executive Secretary may hire an estimator where an expert appraisal is required.

(e) Filing Fee. The Board shall establish a filing fee based upon the cost of the capital improvement, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures being reviewed. Such fees will pay for the costs of an estimator. These fees shall be deposited in the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Fund pursuant to Section 10.178-88 of this code.

(f) Application Procedure.

(1) Filing. Landlords who seek to pass through the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures must file an application on a form prescribed by the Board. The application shall be accompanied by such supporting materials as the Board shall prescribe. All applications must be submitted with the filing fee established by the Board.

(2) Filing Date. Applications must be filed prior to (a) the mailing or delivery of legal notice of a rent increase to the tenants in occupancy of units for which the landlord seeks certification, and (b) establishing any Initial rent pursuant to Section 37.3(d)(1)(C) above.

(g) Effect of Filing Application. Upon the filing of the application, the requested increases will be inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the certification hearing.

(h) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the application for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

(i) Certification Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing shall be held within 45 days of the filing of the application.

(2) Certification. To the greatest extent possible, certification hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated. Where a (Continued on next page)
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landlord and/or tenant has filed a petition for hearing based upon the grounds and under the procedure set forth in Section 37.8, the Board may, in its discretion, consolidate certification hearings with hearings on Section 37.8 petitions.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceeding. Burden of proof is on the landlord. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer. In accordance with the Board's amortization schedules and cost allocation formulas, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the proposed rent increases are justified based upon the following considerations:

(A) The application and its supporting documentation;

(B) Evidence presented at the hearing establishing both the extent and the cost of the work performed;

(C) Estimator's report, where such report has been prepared; and

(D) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in Rules and Regulations.

(5) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed within 30 days of the hearing.

(6) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Certification Decision. If the hearing officer finds that all or any portion of the heretofore ineffective rent increase is justified, the tenant shall be ordered to pay the landlord that amount. If the tenant has paid an amount to the landlord which the hearing officer finds unjustified, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to reimburse the tenant said amount. In either case, however, such an order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party.

(7) Finality of Hearing Officer’s Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his or her decision on appeal.

(8) Appeals. Either party may file an appeal of the hearing officer’s decision with the Board. Such appeals are governed by Section 37.8(b) below.

Sec. 37.8. Arbitration of Rental Increase Adjustments and Verification Procedures.

(a) Authority of Board and Hearing Officers. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to verify initial rents and to arbitrate fair market adjustments, initial rent disputes and rent increase adjustments and the Board shall further have the authority to administer the rent increase protest procedures with respect to RAP rental units as set forth in Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) Verification of Initial Rents.

(I) A tenant whose tenancy begins on or after July 1, 1991 may request a verification from the Board of initial rent. The procedure shall be as follows:

(A) Filing. A request for verification must be filed within 240 days of the tenant's receipt of the rent disclosure statement; provided, however, that where a tenant never receives such a statement, the tenant may file no later than 365 days from the date his or her tenancy commenced. These time limits are mandatory and are therefore deemed jurisdictional. The form of the request shall be determined by the Board.

(B) Notification of Landlord. Upon receipt of the request, the Board shall notify the landlord and request the landlord to submit to the Board, within thirty (30) days of the notification, sufficient documentary evidence to substantiate the initial rent charged to the tenant.

(C) Documentary Evidence. A landlord's documentary evidence may include rent receipts, the rental agreement of the previous tenancy, or such other evidence as the Board may determine to be satisfactory by rule or regulation.

(D) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(2) The Board shall determine whether the documentary evidence submitted by the landlord is sufficient to substantiate the initial rent, or any portion thereof, charged to the tenant. The Board shall mail notice to the parties of its determination within thirty (30) days. All documentary evidence supporting the Board's determination shall be available for inspection by the parties.

(e) Request for Hearing on Determination of Initial Rent.

(1) Filing. A landlord or tenant who seeks to challenge or enforce the Board's determination rendered under Section 37.8(b) above may petition for a hearing on the initial rent. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the Board's determination. This time limit is mandatory and is therefore deemed jurisdictional.

(3) Effect of Filing. Filing a petition for verification or determination of initial rent does not relieve the tenant of his or her obligation to pay rent.

(4) Burden of Proof. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(5) Submission of Evidence; List of Witnesses. At least 72 hours prior to the hearing, both parties shall submit to the Board and to each other copies of all documentary evidence to be introduced at the hearing and a list of names and addresses of potential witnesses to be called. Failure to comply with this subsection may result in the exclusion of evidence and/or the dismissal of the petition.

(6) Hearing Record. In addition to evidence submitted at the hearing, the Board's prior determination and all documentary evidence supporting the determination shall be made part of the hearing record.

(7) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to the initial rent allowed to be charged under Section 37.3(d). If the hearing officer finds that the landlord has not substantiated the initial rent charged, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to continue to charge no more than the level of the initial rent. The Board shall keep a record, by address, of this order. Notwithstanding subsequent tenancies, if any, the order shall be in effect until it is vacated, modified or superseded by another order of the Board.

(8) Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. If the hearing officer finds that the initial rent charged the tenant exceeded the allowable initial rent under Section 37.3(d), the hearing officer may either order the landlord to refund the excess to the tenant within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order said amount offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the landlord.

(9) Further Interrogatories Applicable to Arbitration of Initial Rent Disputes. Hearings conducted pursuant to Section 37.8(c) are further subject to the general hearing procedures set forth in subsections (f)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (b)(6), and (b)(8). Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(10) Additional Remedies. The remedies available in Section 37.8(b) and (c) shall be in addition to any other remedies available to the tenant or the Board.

(11) The Board shall promulgate rules and regulations for the administrative implementation of Section 37.8(e).

(4) Request for Hearing on Fair Market Adjustment.

(1) Filing. A landlord who seeks a fair market adjustment as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)(E)(I) above may petition for a hearing. The petition must be filed on a form and accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe.

(2) Filing Date. Such petition must be filed with the Board no later than 240 days after the commencement of the first new tenancy beginning on or after July 1, 1991. This time limit is mandatory and therefore jurisdictional.

(3) Further Requirements. In addition to the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (2) above, the fair market adjustment hearing and procedures shall be governed by subsections (c)(3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) above, and by subsections (h)(4), (g)(2), (h)(1), (h)(2), (h)(3), (h)(6) and (b)(8) below. Appeals may be taken as provided in subsection (i) below.

(4) Decision of Hearing Officer. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether the landlord shall be permitted a fair market adjustment. If the adjustment is permitted, the hearing officer shall recalculate the establishment of the initial rent as provided in Section 37.3(d)(1)

(Continued on next page)
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above. The adjustment shall be calculated prior to all other calculations of increases and allowances permitted under Section 37.3(d)(1). The hearing officer may order payment to the landlord within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact of any sums owed by the tenant as a result of the recalculation, or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the tenant.

(b) Request for Arbitration: Hearing to Adjust Rents for Tenants in Occupancy.

(1) Landlords. Landlords who seek to impose rent increases which exceed the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a) above must request an arbitration hearing as set forth in this Section. Where there has been a prior order pursuant to Section 37.8(c)(7) which limited the rent increases for a tenant because the landlord failed to substantiate the initial rent charged, the landlord may request an arbitration hearing to establish the tenant's allowable initial rent based upon evidence which was not previously available due to good cause; provided however, that this limitation does not prevent a landlord from requesting an arbitration hearing on the basis of rate of return under subsection (b)(4)(F) below. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Tenants.

(A) Notwithstanding Section 37.3, tenants of non-RAP rental units and tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated on or after July 1, 1977 may request arbitration hearings where the landlord has substantially decreased services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law and/or has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant. Burden of proof is on the tenant: where a tenant claims one or more of the following:

(i) The landlord seeks a rent increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a).

(ii) The landlord has substantially decreased housing services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law.

(iii) The landlord has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation of the charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant.

(iv) The landlord is seeking any rent increase after a hearing officer has ordered no increases pursuant to subsection (c)(7) above.

(B) Tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated prior to July 1, 1977 may petition for a hearing where the landlord has noticed an increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. After a vacancy has occurred in a RAP rental unit in said areas, a new tenant of said unit may petition for a hearing where the landlord has demanded and/or received a rent for that unit which exceeds the rent increase limitation set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(c) Procedure for Landlord Petitioners.

(1) Filing. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and shall be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, justification for the proposed rental increase or substantiation of the initial rent charged where new evidence has become available as provided in Section 37.8(c)(1) above. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Filing Date. The petition must be filed prior to the mailing or delivering to the tenant or tenants legal notice of the rental increase exceeding the limitations as defined in Section 37.3.

(3) Effect of Timely Filing of Petition. Provided a completed petition is timely filed, that portion of the requested rental increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 and has not been certified as a justifiable increase in accordance with Section 37.7 is inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the arbitration hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(d) Procedure for Tenant Petitioners.

(1) Filing; Limitation. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and must be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, a copy of the landlord's notice of rent increase. If the tenant petitioners have received certification findings regarding his rental unit in accordance with Section 37.7, such findings must accompany the petition. If the tenant petitioners have received notice from the Chief Administrative Officer with respect to base rent and amortization of a RAP loan, such notification must accompany the petition. Tenant petitions regarding the gas and electricity pass-through must be filed within one year of the effective date of the pass-through or within one year of the date the pass-through was required to be recalculated pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated by the Board. This time limit is mandatory and therefore deemed jurisdictional. The burden of proof is on the tenant.

(2) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. Responses to a petition for hearing may be submitted in writing.

(e) Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing must be held within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the petition. The level of housing services provided to tenants' rental units shall not be decreased during the period between the filing of the petition and the conclusion of the hearing.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer: Rental Units. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the landlord's proposed rent increase exceeding the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 is justifiable or whether or not the landlord has effected a rent increase through a reduction in services or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance as required by state or local law or whether that landlord is receiving a fair rate of return. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the following factors:

(A) Increases or decreases in operating and maintenance expenses, including, but not limited to, real estate taxes, sewer service charges, janitorial service, refuse removal, elevator service, security systems, and debt service; provided however, when a unit is purchased after the effective date of this ordinance, and this purchase occurs within two (2) years of the date of the previous purchase, consideration shall not be given to that portion of increased debt service which has resulted from a selling price which exceeds the seller's purchase price by more than the percentage increase in the "Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Labor" between the date of previous purchase and the date of the current sale, plus the cost of capital improvements or rehabilitation work made or performed by the seller.

(B) The past history of increases in the rent for the unit and the comparison of the rent for the unit with rents for comparable units in the same general area.

(C) Any findings which have been made pursuant to Section 37.7 with respect to the unit.

(D) Failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement and maintenance in compliance with applicable state and local law.

(E) Prior orders limiting increases pursuant to Section 37.8(c)(7) where the landlord has failed to substantiate the initial rent charged.

(F) The landlord's rate of return.

(G) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in rules and regulations.

(5) Determination of the Hearing Officer: RAP Rental Units.

(A) RAP Rental units in RAP areas designated prior to July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the notified or proposed rental increase exceeds the rent increase limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall apply the rent increase limitations set forth in
Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and all rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto. The hearing officer shall consider the evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(8) RAP rental units in RAP areas designated on or after July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings with respect to rent increases exceeding the limitations as set forth in Section 37.3 of this Chapter. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the factors set forth in subsection (4) above and shall consider evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(6) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed to the parties within 30 days of the hearing.

(7) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. Upon finding that all or any portion of the rent increase is or is not justified, the hearing officer may order payment or refund of all or a portion of that cumulative amount within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party.

(8) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his decision on appeal.

(6) Appeals.

(1) Time and Manner. Any appeal to the Board from the determination of the hearing officer must be made within fifteen (15) calendar days of the mailing of the findings of fact unless such time limit is extended by the Board upon a showing of good cause. The appeal shall be in writing and must state why appellant believes there was either error or abuse of discretion on the part of the hearing officer. The filing of an appeal will stay only that portion of any hearing officer's decision which permits payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent.

(2) Record on Appeal. Upon receipt of an appeal, the entire administrative record of the matter, including the appeal, shall be filed with the Board.

(3) Appeals. The Board shall, in its discretion, hear appeals. In deciding whether or not to hear a given appeal, the Board shall consider, among other factors, fairness to the parties, hardship to either party, and promoting the policies and purposes of this Chapter, in addition to any written comments submitted by the hearing officer whose decision is being challenged. The Board may also review other material from the administrative record of the matter as it deems necessary. A vote of three (3) members shall be required in order for an appeal to be heard.

(4) Remand to Hearing Officer without Appeal Hearing. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer has erred, the Board may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its instructions without conducting an appeal hearing. Both parties shall be notified as to the time of the re-hearing, which shall be conducted within thirty (30) days of remanding by the Board. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer's findings contain numerical or clerical inaccuracies, or require clarification, the Board may continue the hearing for purposes of re-referring the case to said hearing officer in order to correct the findings.

(5) Time of Appeal Hearing; Notice to Parties. Appeals accepted by the Board shall be heard within forty-five (45) days of the filing of an appeal. Within thirty (30) days of the filing of an appeal, both parties shall be notified in writing as to whether or not the appeal has been accepted. If the appeal has been accepted, the notice shall state the time of the hearing and the nature of the hearing. Such notice must be mailed at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(6) Appeal Hearing; Decision of the Board. At the appeal hearing, both appellant and respondent shall have an opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents in support of their positions. After such hearing and after any further investigation which the Board may deem necessary the Board may, upon hearing the appeal, affirm, reverse or modify the hearing officer's decision or may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its findings. The Board's decision must be rendered within forty-five (45) days of the hearing and the parties must be notified of such decision.

(7) Notification of the Parties. In accordance with item (6) above, parties shall receive written notice of the decision. The notice shall state that this decision is final.

(8) Effective Date of Appeal Decisions. Appeal decisions are effective on the date mailed to the parties; provided, however, that that portion of any decision which orders payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent shall become effective thirty (30) calendar days after it is mailed to the parties unless a stay of execution is granted by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Limitation of Actions. A landlord or tenant aggrieved by any decision of the Board must seek judicial review within ninety (90) calendar days of the date of mailing of the decision. Sec. 37.10A. Misdemeanors.

It shall be unlawful for a landlord to increase rent or rents in violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal pursuant to the hearing and appeal procedures set forth in Section 37.8 of this Chapter. It shall further be unlawful for a landlord to charge an initial rent or any subsequent rent which exceeds the limitations of this Chapter. Any person who increases rents in violation of such decisions or who charges excessive initial rents or excessive subsequent rents shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor hereunder shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $2,000.00 or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six (6) months, or by both. Each violation of the decision of a hearing officer or the decision of the Board on appeal as set forth above shall constitute a separate offense. Sec. 37.11A. Civil Actions.

Whenever a landlord fails to comply with the rent disclosure requirements of Section 37.3(c), charges a tenant a rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in this Chapter, or retaliates against a tenant for the exercise of any rights under this Chapter, the tenant may institute a civil proceeding for money damages. A tenant who has been charged an initial rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(d) may, upon prevailing, recover money damages of up to three times actual damages and any other relief the court deems appropriate. The prevailing party in any civil action brought under this Section shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The remedy available under this Section shall be in addition to any other existing remedies which may be available to the tenant.
Condominiums N

PROPOSITION N
Shall the City law that limits the type of buildings and number of units (200 annually) eligible for condominium conversion be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion with no annual limit, and without regard to certain other restrictions in current law, if at least 51% of the tenants give written approval, the building owner provides for 90% financing, the tenant is offered the first chance to buy the unit at 75% of market value, and certain other conditions are met?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under City law, only certain types of buildings may be converted to condominiums. 40% of the building's tenants must state an intent to buy their units. Conversions are limited to 200 units each year.

Current law gives tenants the first chance to buy the unit and the right to continue to rent for a year if they do not buy. Senior citizens or disabled tenants who do not buy may continue to rent as long as they want, unless lawfully evicted.

Current condominium conversion laws also contain a number of other conditions: The building owner must pay the moving expenses of non-purchasing tenants and must show that the building complies with City codes. The building owner must not have a history of discrimination or illegal evictions. If the 200 unit limit on conversions is changed, the law requires that units classified as low and moderate income rental units be sold at prices affordable to low and moderate income buyers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is an ordinance that would create an additional way to convert rental units to condominiums. There would be no limit on the number of units that could be converted each year under Proposition N or on the types of buildings converted.

Proposition N conversions would be allowed if certain conditions are met: (1) at least 80% of the building is occupied; (2) written notice is given to tenants, explaining their rights under this law; (3) at least 51% of the tenants give written approval; (4) tenants are given first chance to buy their units at a price no greater than 75% of the unit's value; (5) tenants are offered financing for at least 90% of the unit's price.

All tenants who do not buy could continue to rent as long as they wanted unless lawfully evicted.

It is unclear whether some sections of current law would apply to Proposition N conversions. These include sections on: moving expenses, tenants' statements of intent to buy, code compliance, low and moderate income housing, past illegal evictions and discrimination.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

If the proposed Ordinance is approved, in my opinion, it would increase the total property tax revenues of the City and County by an indeterminable, but possibly substantial, amount. Additionally, certain permit and inspection services which are presently paid by toll fees for service might increase by an indeterminable amount.

The amount of the potential increase in revenue would depend upon the number of properties converted under provisions in the Ordinance and their respective assessed valuations.

How “N” Got on the Ballot
On August 9, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bill Maher, Jim Gonzalez, Willie B. Kennedy and Tom Hsieh. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
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PROPOINENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Renters' Choice. The choice to buy a home is part of the American Dream that should not be denied to any San Franciscan. Proposition N allows renters to become home-owners if the landlord and the tenants agree, while protecting tenants who choose to rent, and improving our neighborhoods.

Proposition N is the opportunity for a better San Francisco.

RENTERS WILL BENEFIT

Over the years, monthly rent adds up to a lot of money. Many City residents do not have the large down payment it takes to buy a home in today's market, and find themselves trapped in this expensive renting cycle. Home ownership provides financial security and stability.

With Proposition N, renters will have the opportunity to purchase their apartments from the owner at 75 percent of market value (determined by an independent appraiser), with no more than a 10 percent down payment. The owner will arrange for the financing. Fifty one percent of the building's renters must agree to purchase, and residents who choose to rent are protected by rent control laws for the rest of their lives.

Proposition N is by and for the renters of San Francisco.

OUR CITY WILL BENEFIT

As renters become home owners, the sales transactions will generate property tax revenue for San Francisco. Proposition N will increase revenue to support important City services such as health care, MUNI, police and fire protection, and will improve our quality of life at no cost to the general public. Proposition N is a good deal on both sides of the handshake.

Vote Yes for Renter's Choice.

Vote Yes for new home ownership opportunities in San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

John Eaton
President, Renters for Home Ownership

Nicole Sunahara
Vice-President, Renters for Home Ownership

REBUTTAL TO PROPOINENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

There is a major eviction loophole in this Initiative. Because of recently enacted State law, the lifetime leases the proponents guarantee are not solely a matter of local control and cannot be relied upon.

Who would argue with the idea of tenants "owning" their own homes? All of us support home ownership. But in a city where the average price for a condominium is over $250,000, affordability is a critical concern.

The new system proposed by Proposition N was actually tried in San Francisco over 10 years ago.

All of the benefits touted by the sponsors of Proposition N were part of that system.

How did it work out?

89% of all the tenants in buildings that were converted did not become homeowners.

Only 11% of the people who signed intents to purchase actually bought their homes.

That's why San Francisco adopted an ordinance limiting the number of rental units converted to condominiums to 200 annually. Proposition N would abolish this limit.

It will benefit a handful of people who might purchase their units at $150,000 - $200,000 and then turn around and sell their units at $200,000 - $265,000. This is one of the serious flaws in Proposition N.

Nothing in Proposition N guarantees real, long-term affordability. Proposition N is bad public policy. I urge you to vote NO.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

This is a Reagan-like de-regulation of a system that works just fine. Proposition N would deregulate the condominium conversion process. Condo developers would be allowed to convert an unlimited number of apartments to more expensive condominiums.

The City’s current law allows up to 200 rental units per year to be converted to condominiums. Enacted in 1982, it represented a compromise between “free market” advocates who were willing to accept the loss of 500 – 1000+ rental units a year and housing/community advocates seeking to ban conversions altogether. That compromise has worked.

Proposition N sets up a second, brand-new conversion process that allows an unlimited number of conversions. It’s effectively a repeal of the current annual limit.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned a study of condo conversions that took place before we had a limit: 89% of the tenants in converted buildings were displaced by conversion. They did not become homeowners.

Finally, the much touted tenant protections and affordability provisions of Proposition N are either the same or similar to current City law, or in some cases, significantly weaker.

Unlimited condo conversions are a bad deal for San Francisco. Vote no on Proposition N.

Mayor Art Agnos

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Mayor Agnos, you are fortunate enough to own your own home. All we renters want is the same choice you had when you became part of the American Dream of home ownership.

You’re wrong when you say that the present system works “just fine.”

The City’s current system is faulty because it is landlord driven. Under the “annual limit” law you support, renters are being displaced, which is nothing to brag about.

PROPOSITION N IS TENANT DRIVEN — IT GUARANTEES THAT NO TENANT CAN BE DISPLACED.

All San Franciscans should have the opportunity to become a home owner. The argument for an “annual limit” in the number of renters buying a home translates shamefully into “I’ve got mine.”

FOR EVERY APARTMENT THAT IS PURCHASED, RENTERS BECOME HOMEOWNERS. PROPOSITION N MEETS THE NEED FOR HOME OWNERSHIP.

Current City laws do not provide sufficient protections or affordability safeguards for renters. PROPOSITION N ALLOWS RENTERS TO BENEFIT FROM A DISCOUNT OF 25% OFF EACH UNIT AND LOW DOWN PAYMENTS.

Proposition N will generate desperately needed revenue for important City services. HOME OWNERSHIP BUILDS STRONGER COMMUNITIES AND CIVIC PRIDE.

We speak as the renters of San Francisco — 70% of the City’s population. We want opportunities for affordable home ownership. We are young couples, families, single-income renters. We are hard-working San Franciscans . . . we are not politicians. When the majority of the residents here cannot afford to buy a home, the system is not working.

John Eaton
Nicole Sunahara
Renters for Home Ownership

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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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Yes on Proposition N. Vote for affordable homeownership.
Proposition N is a win-win proposition. It allows tenants in buildings where a majority of renters wish to buy, to become homeowners. It protects those who do not wish to buy with lifetime leases. Proposition N results in new revenue for city services.
Protect tenants — provide homeownership opportunities — fund important city services.
Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Homeownership is the American ideal. Recent polls show more than 80% of San Franciscans want to own their own home.
Proposition N, The Home Ownership Initiative, is the first real attempt in twenty years to create significant new affordable home ownership opportunities in San Francisco.
Proposition N will allow that. For years our city's policies have been anti-home ownership. City Hall has taken the cavalier attitude that if you're middle class and want to own a home, you will just have to leave town. We have adopted policy after policy preventing meaningful affordable home ownership opportunities. Proposition N allows renters to buy their homes at affordable prices.
Proposition N requires that a majority of the tenants agree in writing to the choice of purchasing their own units.
Proposition N requires that if the landlord decides to sell, he must offer tenants their units at no more than 75% of their market value and at 90% financing — a huge savings to tenants.
Proposition N guarantees long term leases for any tenants who choose not to purchase. Those who choose to continue renting are protected for life.
It has been suggested that this will reduce rentals in the City. Isn't it far better to allow people to own their own homes than to force them to rent forever or else leave town? Shouldn't we be proud to have a goal of a City where the majority of its residents own their homes? Proposition N will triple the number of San Franciscans who can own their own homes while protecting its renters.
Not one person will be evicted because of Proposition N. Please join me and many thousands of San Franciscans in making affordable home ownership a reality.
Vote yes on Proposition N.

Supervisor Bill Maher

As an architect, and Member of the Board of Supervisors, I have been involved in creating affordable housing for San Franciscans for decades.
Proposition N is creative and fair housing legislation that will keep our City livable and economically sound.
Proposition N will allow average income San Franciscans in an apartment building to democratically and economically purchase individual apartments from their landlord. Renters who choose not to buy get lifetime leases.
Existing laws already protect low income rental units from being affected by this new law — so, Proposition N works for the common good of all San Franciscans.
Proposition N is good public policy.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

The way things are now in our City, working people, paying rent in very expensive apartments for years and years end up with nothing to show for it.
Many are forced to move to distant suburbs and towns to find home ownership opportunities.
It's time to be creative and provide NEW opportunities for first-time home buyers. Proposition N allows folks to buy their units at a discount, low down payment, and landlords have to help finance the purchase.
Renters that do not choose to buy get lifetime leases.
Proposition N will help middle income San Franciscans achieve the American Dream.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION N.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

After being a renter here in San Francisco for over ten years, this opportunity to become a home owner seems like the light at the end of the tunnel. Prop N would give us a choice to either buy or continue renting and the fact that nobody can be displaced is very comforting to everyone concerned.
Give us all the unique chance to make our own decisions to either become home owners or remain as renters by voting Yes on N

Hedwig Montalvo

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

Proposition N is a win-win proposal for renters and the City. Homeownership creates more involved and dedicated San Franciscans who will participate in the progress of our community. Homeownership increases the City’s tax base which provides more funds for public amenities and human services.

Proposition N creates new opportunities for homeownership while strictly protecting the City’s affordable housing stock. Proposition N provides lifetime leases for renters that do not buy their units.

What could be more fair? Vote Yes on Prop. N.

Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

As a San Francisco small business owner for over 35 years, I have witnessed first hand how home ownership builds strong neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, the price of a home has risen so much that most renters have no hope of owning their own home in the City. So, these renters choose the only option open to them: they leave the City, and buy in the suburbs.

I support Proposition N because I want to create real, new home ownership opportunities for first-time San Francisco home buyers. It’s time we stop driving the middle class out of San Francisco. Please join me in giving renters the choices they need to buy homes in San Francisco. Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Mike Salerno

While you can pick up the newspaper and find hundreds of rentals in all price ranges, it is impossible to find a house or condominium that is affordable to the average person in this City. This is more than a crisis, it is a disgrace.

Prop N is about our lives and the lives of thousands of renters who dream of becoming home owners, without having to move out of San Francisco. Prop N is a winning proposition for the renter and for the City of San Francisco. Vote YES on N!

George Polley

Under the Renters’ Choice Initiative, Proposition N, renters can purchase the apartments they live in when the owner and more than one-half of the current tenants in the building agree to a conversion. The proposition will have significant financial benefits to the renter/homeowner, the City’s fiscal health and to the City’s economy in general, including:

A. BENEFITS TO TENANT/HOMEOWNER
1. Reduction in income taxes due to the deduction of mortgage interest and real property taxes.
2. Reduction in periodic payroll withholding tax due to a reduction of income taxes.
3. The tenant/homeowner can fix his housing expense and may have greater spendable income which may increase with time by obtaining a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

B. BENEFITS TO CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1. Increased transfer tax revenue due to the purchase of apartment units by the tenant.
2. Increased property tax revenue due to the higher real property valuation resulting from individual ownership of apartment units.
3. Increased sales and use tax revenue as a result of consumption by new homeowners who may have more after-tax spendable income.
4. Help balance the City’s budget by increasing tax revenues to the City.

C. SAN FRANCISCO’S ECONOMY AND BUSINESS CLIMATE

When more people become homeowners in the City, the homeowners’ long-term financial stability is enhanced. They also have major tax deductions which they would not have as renters. These factors may translate into more spendable after tax income which strengthens the local economy and encourages investment.

Bruce A. Miller
Kenneth Leventhal & Company
Certified Public Accountants

While well-off homeowners are able to build up equity, enjoy mortgage payments that don’t increase every year (as rent does!), and savor the satisfaction of owning their own homes, tenants have none of these opportunities. Help to reverse this trend by allowing everybody to buy a home and keep San Franciscans here who would otherwise be forced to move out. Vote Yes on Prop N.

Ivan Kinkennon

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

It would be a tragedy if San Francisco were to let itself go the way of too many other large cities in which home ownership is only the right of the extremely rich and the subsidized poor. It is the middle-income workers like myself and my neighbors who pay the taxes that support subsidized housing and who underwrite the lives of the wealthy. As middle-income residents leave for the suburbs in search of the homes they are denied here, the city suffers — in a loss of diversity, a loss of tax revenue, and a loss of will, frankly. This town will become like too many others, a city of extreme wealth and extreme poverty — with no one left to foot the bill. Vote Yes on N.

John George Bilotta

Home ownership is a prime opportunity that many San Francisco citizens cannot achieve without Prop N. This legislation is fair, honest and provides numerous safeguards to protect renters. Taxes generated by home sales will create funds for the City’s health, fire and police protection. Prop N is a good deal for San Francisco. Please vote yes on Prop N.

Stanley DeSouza

I urge you to vote in favor of Prop N, thus giving the opportunity of home ownership to many people who will otherwise be forced to eventually buy homes out of the City and commute in and out of town to their workplace. I’ve rented in the same apartment complex for over 14 years and welcome this opportunity. Vote Yes on N!

Gladys Messersmith

Rent increases, unreasonable landlords, poor maintenance ... I hate being a renter! Without Proposition N, I would never have the opportunity to own my home in San Francisco. I urge every voter who has paid enough in monthly rent to buy the 10 apartments ten times over, but can’t come up with the hefty down payment needed to buy a home, to vote YES on N.

Kris Matsuyama

THANK YOU Supervisors Gonzalez, Hsieh, Kennedy, and Maher for standing up for the “underdog” renters. It’s about time that City Hall started thinking about practical legislation to deal with the problem of affordable housing for the people who live and work in San Francisco.

Erika K. Pringsheim

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Allowing more apartments to become condominiums reduces rental housing, driving up rents for 70% of San Franciscans unable to purchase a home. Protect rental housing. Vote No on N!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Prop N will deplete the number of rent-controlled apartments by allowing more units to “go condo” each year. We say: Look for ways to build new housing, but don’t take away the few affordable units we have! Vote NO on N!

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s St. Peter’s Housing Committee

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

Proposition N’s “eviction protections” don’t kick in until after the building is converted to condominiums, when it’s too late. The developers will get rid of tenants who don’t “cooperate” and rent to only upscale tenants who can afford to buy expensive condos and then convert. That’s what they used to do and they will do it again under Prop. N.

Proposition N is merely a loophole in the condo conversion law designed to help landlords and developers make a quick profit. All the real renters organizations oppose this fraud.

No on N!

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Golden Gateway Tenants Association
Community Tenants Association
Park Merced Residents Association
North of Market Planning Coalition

We’ve all been victims of the phony “sale” price. You know, the kind where you think you got a great deal. Then you find out that first they inflated the regular price, then they gave you the “discount”. You still end up paying way too much.

That’s how Prop N works. First they double or triple the value of the apartment by converting it to a condo. Then they offer the “discount” on the inflated price! Then they “offer” you financing with a big balloon payment in five years! Thanks, but no thanks.

Don’t be a victim of a phoney fast-talking sales pitch. Vote no on N.

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Tenants Union

They promise lifetime leases to tenants who don’t buy. But they forgot about State law. When those condominiums are sold, the new owners will use Gov. Code Sec. 7060 et Seq. to remove their condo from rental use, evicting the tenants with “lifetime” leases. And it’s all perfectly legal because State law overrides City law.

Completely unlimited condo conversions, loss of affordable apartments, useless “lifetime” leases? Say no to “N”.

You don’t have to go far to see why Proposition N won’t work. For four years San Francisco operated under a law that was virtually identical to Prop. N. Most of its provisions — including the tenants’ “agreement” to conversion and protections for tenants who don’t buy — were adopted in 1979 and are still on the books.

Unfortunately, without a reasonable annual limit on conversions, the law just doesn’t work.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned the only comprehensive study of condominium conversions ever done in San Francisco.

The startling conclusion: 89% of the original tenants in converted buildings were evicted or otherwise displaced by the conversion, despite all the Prop. N style protections.

Prop. N means unlimited conversions. Don’t turn the clock back ten years or more. Vote No on N.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
Supervisor Carole Migden
College Board Member Tim Wolfred
School Board Vice President Tom Ammiano
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

Proposition N is what gives SOME landlords and SOME supervisors a bad name. San Francisco’s condominium conversion law is a Board of Supervisors ordinance, not enacted by initiative. Proposition N, however, is an initiative propounded by ONLY 4 members of the Board of Supervisors (Hsieh, Maher, Kennedy, Gonzalez) and not even by the number of registered voters’ signatures required to qualify an initiative by petition. If enacted, Proposition N will be inflexible and impervious to change except by another costly ballot measure. Proposition N shouldn’t be on the ballot; it’s bad government, wrought by the ultimate selfish special interest, and the San Francisco Taxpayers Association strongly urges its rejection.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Vice President Quentin L. Kopp

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

Don’t be fooled by the condominium developers. San Francisco already has a law that:

- Prevents conversions in buildings where there have been any evictions for the purposes of converting in the 18 months before the conversion (not just after the conversion when its too late like Prop. N)
- Guarantees senior citizens and permanently disabled tenants life-time leases
- Guarantees rents for those who remain in the building are covered by rent control

What are the condominium developers up to?
Proposition N would effectively repeal the current limit of 200 conversions a year and allow a completely unlimited number effective immediately!

The results of Mayor Feinstein’s Condominium conversion study are clear: Proposition N will result in 89% of the tenants in the buildings being converted being moved out.
Don’t be fooled by phoney discounts on inflated prices. We urge you to vote no on Prop. N.

Assemblyman John Burton

Another Bad idea from four politicians looking for easy campaign contributions. Don’t let the real estate industry hijack our city to the land of condomania. Vote No on N.

David C. Spero

Proposition N is the most blatant example of a greedy special interest measure on this year’s municipal election ballot. It represents the epitome of stealthy manipulation of Board of Supervisor members to accommodate CERTAIN landlords. Moreover, its very provisions were invalidly revised AFTER it was submitted to the Registrar of Voters by a wealthy property owner. I’m voting NO on it and I urge other voters to do the same.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

The San Francisco Democratic Party urges you to vote NO on Proposition N.
Many San Franciscans cannot afford to buy a home. The effect of this proposition is to shrink the availability of rental housing and force San Francisco rental and home ownership costs even higher.
The average home in San Francisco sells for over $350,000. This proposition would require a prospective homebuyer to provide a $35,000 down payment, far more than most San Franciscans can afford.

Say no to the “Real estate Profit” proposition. Vote NO on Proposition N.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Connie O’Connor, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes, Second Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Steve Neuberger, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Adrian Berinquer, Jr., Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Susan J. Bierman, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Lula M. Carter, First Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Agar Jaicks, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Maria Martinez, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Catherine J. Dodd, RN, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Shirley Black, Member
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Leslie Katz, Recording Secretary
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Alicia Wang, Third Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION N

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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

RENTER'S CHOICE MEASURE: HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XIII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (SUBDIVISION CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 1396 THEREOF TO CREATE HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES BY CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS AND ADDING SECTION 1396b THERETO TO EXEMPT FROM THE CONVERSION LIMITATIONS OF SECTION 1396 THE CONVERSION OF APARTMENT UNITS IN ANY APARTMENT BUILDINGS WHERE MORE THAN HALF OF THE TENANTS AGREE TO THE CONVERSION, MAKING FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE EXEMPTION, AND AMENDING CHAPTER 37 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 37 OF THEREOF TO PROVIDE THAT LANDLORDS MAY NOT EVICT TENANTS FROM UNITS CONVERTED TO CONDOMINIUMS UNDER SUBDIVISION CODE SECTION 1396b ON THE GROUND THAT THE LANDLORD OR A RELATIVE DESIRES TO OCCUPY THE UNIT.

Section 1. Findings.

In the 1980's, there was a dramatic inflation in real estate prices in San Francisco. During this decade, the increase in median home price far exceeded the increased in the median household income for the City. This widening gap between home prices and incomes has placed the benefits of home ownership beyond the reach of a majority of San Francisco households. The inflation in real estate prices has virtually excluded first-time home buyers from the housing market and has made it extremely difficult for expanding families who have recently purchased a home from trading up to a larger home more suitable to the needs of a large family.

The City should expand the opportunities for owner-occupancy of housing and develop efficient programs to facilitate home ownership for households of varied income levels. The conversion of rental apartments to condominiums is a potential source of affordable owner-occupied housing. However, condominium conversions are a major source of housing loss for home ownership, because of the goal of avoiding displacement of tenants.

These amendments balance such goals by providing affordable home ownership opportunities through regulations which will allow the sale of residential units at below-market prices with low down payments, and will not displace tenants who do not elect to purchase their units. The program will also provide financial and other benefits to the City by creating stable long-term residents, increasing the City's real estate tax base and providing additional revenue from transfer taxes.

Under these regulations, complete applications for conversion of apartment buildings will be accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis. Buildings will be eligible for conversion when, among other things:

(a) 80% of the residential units in the building are occupied at the time of filing the application and not less than 51% of the tenants have approved in writing of the conversion.

(b) The subdivider shall have obtained and furnished to each tenant a copy of an independent appraisal of the market value of each unit.

(c) No tenant shall be evicted or involuntarily relocated because of the sale of units, and any tenant who does not elect to purchase his or her unit may be extended a life time lease with full rights and privileges under the City's rent control ordinances. In addition, the proposed regulations provide that upon the death of an elderly non-purchasing tenant, the unit may be leased by the other's spouse or domestic partner of the deceased with the same privileges.

(d) The cost associated with conversion or code compliance may not be passed on to the tenants or purchasers of the units.

(e) Within a year of issuance of the Department of Real Estate public report tenants will be offered the right to purchase their unit for not more than 75% of the fair market value (as determined by current appraisal) as of the date of filing the application.

(f) To each tenant's purchase of the unit, the subdivider shall cause to be offered to the tenant financing in an amount, as elected by the tenant, of at least 90% of the purchase price. At least 90% of the principal amount of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of 25 years and the balance of such financing shall extend for a minimum term of five years. The fixed or variable interest rate, loan fees and closing costs on all such financing shall be no higher than that offered by the Bank of America for a 25 year fixed or variable home mortgage in equivalent amount.

(g) Tenants who purchase their units must represent in writing that such units will be used as a residence for not less than 12 months, and

(h) No landlord may evict the tenant because of the landlord's desire to occupy or have a relative occupy the tenants unit.

Section 2; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by amending Section 1396 thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 1396. ANNUAL CONVERSION LIMITATION. This section governing annual limitation shall apply only to conversion of residential units.

Subject to the provisions of Section 1396b, applications for conversions of residential units, whether vacant or occupied, shall not be accepted by the Department of Public Works during the period of January 1, 1990 – December 31, 1993, inclusive, except that a maximum of 200 units, as selected yearly by lottery by the Department of Public Works from all eligible applicants, may be approved for conversion per year during the aforementioned period for the following categories of buildings:

(a) Buildings consisting of four units or less in which one of the units has been occupied continuously by one of the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(b) Buildings consisting of six units or less in which 50 percent or more of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director; or

(c) Community apartments as defined in Section 1308 of this Code, which, on or before December 31, 1982, met the criteria for community apartments in Section 1308 of this code and which were approved as a subdivision by the Department of Public Works on or before December 31, 1982, and where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

The conversion of a stock cooperative as defined in Section 1308 of this Code to condominiums shall be exempt from the annual limitation imposed on the number of conversions in this Section if the requirement to be selected by lottery where 75 percent of the units have been occupied continuously by the applicant owners of record for three years prior to the date of registration for the lottery as selected by the Director.

No application for conversions of a residential building submitted by a registrant shall be approved by the Department of Public Works to fill the unused portion of the 200 unit annual limitation for the previous year.

The provision of this Section shall become operative on January 1, 1990.

Section 3; Amending Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) by adding Section 1396b thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 1396b. CONVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS WITH APPROVAL OF MAJORITY OF TENANTS—NO EVICTIONS

(a) Notwithstanding Section 1396 of this Code, from and after the effective date of this Section, the Department of Public Works shall accept on a first-come, first-served basis (as hereinafter set forth) completed applications for conversion to condominiums of residential apartments, where no less than 80% of the residential units in such buildings are occupied at the time of filing the application. Buildings converted under this Section must meet the conditions of the following Subsections (b) through (g). For purposes of this Section, a "building" shall include an apart-
ment complex under a single ownership or approved as a single development. Applications for conversion under this Section shall be approved on a first-come, first-served basis among applicants who have submitted complete applications, which applications shall be deemed complete when the conditions of the following subsections (b) through (g) have been met. The Department of Public Works shall approve a completed application which complies with all the provisions hereof within six months of filing of such application or such application shall be deemed approved.

(b) The subdivider shall (i) give written notice of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants pursuant to the provisions of this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (ii) provide to the tenant an appraisal of the fair market value of each tenant's unit as of a date not more than 90 days prior to the filing of a complete application. The fair market value shall be determined by an independent appraisal by a licensed member of the American Appraisal Institute paid for by the subdivider.

(c) Within five days of filing an application for a Tentative Map with the Department of Public Works for conversion of a building under this Section, (i) the subdivider shall give written notice (by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested) of the proposed conversion to all tenants containing a description of the specific rights of tenants provided in this Section, including the right of first refusal to purchase the unit and the prohibition against eviction of any tenant by reason of the conversion, and (ii) the proposed conversion shall be approved in writing by not less than 51 percent of the tenants of the building. The provisions of Section 1388 of this Code shall also apply to conversions under this Section.

(d) No tenant on the date of filing of the application or, in the event of a voluntary vacation or eviction for cause, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report, shall be evicted or involuntarily relocated as a result of a conversion under this Section. The lease of any tenant who does not elect to purchase his or her unit shall be extended until the death of such tenant or until the tenant vacates the unit, either voluntarily or as a result of a lawful eviction. A non-purchasing tenant who elects to remain in his or her unit shall be the subject to the same rights and privileges as are applicable under an lease for the unit until the expiration of the lease and thereafter under Administrative Code Chapter 37. The provisions of Section 1391 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section. None of the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures required under the City's Housing, Building, or City Planning Codes for the filing of a Final Map may be passed through to the tenants in the form of a rent increase under Administrative Code Section 37.7. Upon the death of any non-purchasing tenant aged 62 or older occupying a unit converted to a condominium under this Section, any surviving spouse or domestic partner (as defined in the San Francisco Municipal Code) who was a member of such tenant's household within one month prior to the death of the tenant shall be entitled to all the rights of a tenant in such unit under this Section and under Administrative Code Chapter 37.

(e) Within one year of the issuance of the State Department of Real Estate's Final Subdivision Public Report for any building converted to condominiums under this Section, the subdivider shall enter in writing to each tenant at the date of filing of the application (or, in the event such tenant voluntarily vacates or is evicted for cause before the issuance of the Public Report, a tenant in occupancy at the date of issuance of the Public Report) a non-transferable right to purchase the unit occupied by such tenant. The price offered by the Subdivider for such unit shall be no more than 75 percent of the fair market value of such unit as of the date of the filing of the application. Such offer may not be extended by the subdivider to the tenant before the recordation of the Final Map or Parcel Map and the issuance of the Public Report. Such right to purchase shall extend for 90 days from the date the subdivider first offers the unit to the tenant. The period for acceptance of the offer may be extended by an agreement in writing between the subdivider and tenant. The tenant may cancel his or her agreement to purchase the subdivider's interest or may extend the offer to the tenant within six months of a written agreement to purchase the unit. The provisions of Section 1387 of this Code shall not apply to buildings converted under this Section.

(f) To finance the purchase by each tenant of the unit occupied, the subdivider shall cause to be offered financing to be provided to each tenant from either a conventional lending institution or purchase money financing from the subdivider in an amount, at the election of the tenant, of at least 90 percent of the purchase price for the unit. Such financing shall be secured by one or more deeds of trust on the unit. Ninety percent of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of 25 years, and the balance of the principal amount of such financing shall be for a minimum term of five years. All such financing shall be subject to a fixed or variable rate of interest, loan fee, and closing costs no higher than the rates offered by the Bank of America for a 25-year fixed or variable home mortgage for a loan of an amount equivalent to the amount to be financed at the time the tenant accepts the subdivider's offer. Tenants shall not be required to accept such financing as a condition of purchase.

(g) Before the transfer of title to any unit converted under this Section, the subdivider shall submit to the City's Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Surveys and Mapping Division, the following for each unit:

- (1) Copies of the notices of the proposed conversion given in accordance with Subsections (b) and (c) and a representation under penalty of perjury that the notices were timely provided to the tenant occupying the unit;
- (2) A copy of the subdivider's offer to sell the unit to the tenant in accordance with Subsection (e), including a statement of the price and the terms of financing offered to the tenant;
- (3) A copy of the appraisal of the unit;
- (4) With respect to units whose tenants elect to purchase, a letter from the tenant stating the sale price of the unit, the amount of the down payment, the terms of the financing, and a representation under penalty of perjury that such unit will be used as the principal residence of such tenant for a period of not less than twelve months following the date of transfer of title.
- (5) Such information as are required under Section 1381 of this Code.

Section 4. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Section 37.9 (a) (8) and 37.9(a) thereof, to read as follows:

Sec. 37.9 Evictions. Notwithstanding Section 37.3, this Section shall apply as of August 24, 1980, to all landlords and tenants of rental units as defined in Section 37.2(e). A landlord shall not endeavor to recover possession of a rental unit unless:

- (8) (A) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit on or before the thirtieth day after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without illiterior reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use or occupancy as his or her own principal residence, or for the use as occupancy as the principal residence of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, or the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 10 percent interest in the property. A landlord may not recover possession under this subsection if a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It

(Continued on next page)
shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or

(B) For landlords who become owners of record of the rental unit more than 30 days after the Mayor has approved this amendment, the landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith, without ulterior reasons and with honest intent, for the landlord's use or occupancy as his or her principal resident of the landlord's children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brother or sister, of the landlord's spouse or the spouses of such relations, for a period of at least 12 continuous months. For purposes of this subsection, the term "landlord" shall be defined as an owner of record of at least 25 percent interest on the property. A landlord may not recover possession under the subsection if a comparable unit on the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy. If a comparable unit in the building is already vacant and available, or if such unit becomes vacant and available during the period of the notice terminating tenancy, if comparable unit does become vacant and available during said notice period, the landlord shall rescind the notice to vacate. It shall be rebuttably presumed that the landlord has not acted in good faith if the owner or relative for whom the tenant was evicted does not move into the unit and occupy said unit for a minimum of 12 continuous months; or This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B, if being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of desire to occupy such unit by landlord or landlord's relative; or

(9) The landlord seeks to recover possession in good faith in order to sell the unit in accordance with a condominium conversion approved under the San Francisco subdivision ordinance and does so without ulterior reasons and with honest intent. This subsection shall not apply to residential units converted to condominiums under San Francisco Subdivision Code Section 1396B; if being the intention hereunder that no tenant of a residential unit converted under this Section 1396B shall be evicted by reason of landlord's desire to sell the unit or to have the unit occupied by another person.

WE NEED POLL WORKERS!
If you are available on Tuesday, November 5, 1991 to work at a polling place, please turn to Page 2 of this pamphlet.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION O

We the people of the City and County of San Francisco reaffirm our unqualified support for the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States which reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

We hold that these provisions, particularly as they relate to freedom of expression, are absolute and without exception. We oppose any and all efforts of government, at any level, to regulate or restrict the content of the print, broadcast, and electronic media; the visual and performing arts; music; or any other form of speech. We call upon the State of California and the Government of the United States to cease and desist all acts of censorship. We also call upon the City and County of San Francisco to cease and desist all efforts to restrict freedom of expression and ask that no city funds be used in a manner contrary to the spirit of this initiative.

We ordain that the community standards of the City and County of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance, and the rejection of every form of censorship.

NOT SURE IF YOU CAN GET TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON NOVEMBER 5, 1991?

Apply for an absentee ballot by completing the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. Put a stamp on it and mail it in. We will mail your ballot within three days after we receive your application.
First Amendment

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to affirm the City's unqualified support for the First Amendment right to freedom of expression?

YES  ➡

NO  ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Freedom of expression is protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and by the California Constitution.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to affirm San Francisco's unqualified support of the First Amendment. The measure says that the people of San Francisco oppose all government efforts to regulate or restrict any form of expression. Proposition O calls on the federal, state and City governments to stop all efforts to restrict freedom of expression. The measure asks that no City funds be used contrary to the spirit of this measure.

The measure states that the community standards of San Francisco are diversity, tolerance and the rejection of every form of censorship.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this policy about freedom of expression.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "O"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How "O" Got on the Ballot
On August 1, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 valid signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 22, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,500 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,101 more than the required number of signatures.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION O IS ON PAGE 140.
First Amendment

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Our nation’s Founders wisely wrote a Constitution to limit government power. Just in case they hadn’t made it clear enough that government powers must be strictly limited, they added a Bill of Rights specifically forbidding government from infringing on certain important liberties.

The First Amendment protects freedom of speech and the press. The Founders made clear that the Constitution forbade government from infringing on any speech or publication. James Madison, considered the Father of the Constitution wrote, “Is then the federal government destitute of every authority for restraining the licentiousness of the press? . . . the answer must be, that the federal government is destitute of all such authority.” George Hay, a U.S. District Attorney, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and later a Federal Judge, in 1799 said, “If the words ‘freedom of the press’ have any meaning at all they mean a total exemption from any law making any publication whatever criminal.”

Thomas Jefferson wrote, “No definite line can be drawn between the inestimable liberty of the press and its demoralizing licentiousness. If there is still impropriety . . . its supplement must be sought in the censorship of public opinion.” Or, if you are offended by it, don’t buy it. The Founders wisely left the decision about what publications should be read up to the individual reader. The First Amendment protects your right to decide what you will or will not read. By voting “Yes” you reaffirm your right to make your own decisions about what you will read.

On this 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights reaffirm your support for this important document. Rights are not determined by majority vote, nor should they be, but a reaffirmation of freedom is always needed.

John Whisman, Co-Chair
Maria Pinto, Co-Chair
First Amendment Coalition

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

We marvel as the Soviet people struggle to attain the basic rights that Americans have been guaranteed for 200 years under the Bill of Rights. Ironically, so accustomed are we to these freedoms, we also risk losing them bit by bit. Recently, we have seen the erosion of free speech from government-censored Persian Gulf war coverage to Mapplethorpe's rap music. The Soviets have shown themselves to be willing to fight for freedom of expression. We should do no less. Defend your constitutional rights. Vote "Yes." Let freedom ring!

Greg Vogel
Business Consultant
George Meyer, member
American Civil Liberties Union

We must not trust government to determine the morality of speech or action. Contrary to the language and the spirit of the First Amendment, the Supreme Court, and lower courts, have determined that there are ideas and opinions that should be suppressed. The Court ruled that "community standards" can be an excuse to make exceptions to the First Amendment. Let's establish a standard in our community opposing all forms of censorship. Vote "Yes".

Glenn Cripe
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Government regulation of speech results in intellectual stagnation. Court rooms and prisons become the garbage heap of unpopular ideas or images. But these ideas or images force a society to ponder, to look at itself critically, to find truth, and create a better world in which to live. Freedom of expression is an inalienable individual right, as our Founders clearly recognized; those who want to restrict it, no matter what their excuses, oppose freedom.

Proposition "O" will remind the government and the citizenry that the First Amendment is the law. Supreme Courts and Attorney Generals may come and go, but the First Amendment must be preserved.

Jeffrey Jones
Californians Against Censorship Together

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; our Constitution was devised to protect these rights against government repression, by ascribing limited and clearly delineated powers. The intent of the First Amendment is to prevent government interference with individual freedom of thought and conscience. Today, the First Amendment is under attack from those whose intent is to impose their views on others. Proposition "O" supports, "without exception", the First Amendment as the absolute law of the land, and says our government must cease breaking the law. Send a clear message that America's tradition of liberty is alive in San Francisco. Vote "Yes".

Mark Valverde

The Voter Pamphlet is [CENSORED].
City Attorney Renne has gotten local court authorization to censor dozens of ballot arguments — anything judged to be "false", "misleading" or "irrelevant".
Last time Mayor Agnos tried to deal land near City College to a profiteering developer, a ballot argument was censored because it mentioned the $60,000 Agnos once "forgot" to pay taxes on, as proving Agnos untrustworthy.
Renne's rationale was that improprieties in Agnos' past were irrelevant.
She's entitled to her opinion.
But the government should have no right to censor its critics.
The idea of elections is for the voters to decide.
Print all opinions in the Voter Pamphlet.
Vote yes.

Grassroots

Send Jesse Helms a message that the First Amendment is alive and well in 1991. As we just saw in the Rust v. Sullivan decision, the First Amendment is being threatened. It is unacceptable for the Federal government to issue a gag rule attacking the right of a physician to counsel on abortion and to use the withdrawal of federal funds as an economic hammer against free speech. Vote "yes".

Mayor Art Agnos

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Two centuries ago, pornography was legal throughout the country. But between the mid-1800s and mid-1900s, laws were passed against "vices" — abortion, gambling, alcohol, marijuana — including "obscenity".

And, after being sold legally for a century, Fanny Hill was banned.

Now the tide has turned. Fanny Hill is no longer illegal. But people still get arrested for selling books and films. Nowadays it's legal to do most of the things it used to be illegal to even write about.

We have the right to take part in orgies — but not videotape them!

Pornography doesn't spread AIDS.

If America can tolerate sexual freedom in real life, we can tolerate it in literature and film.

Bring back the First Amendment. Vote yes.

Grassroots

Art does not flourish through censorship. Freedom of expression dies when an artist's First Amendment rights are denied. This has a chilling effect that imprisons the thoughts of the artist and encourages self-censorship out of fear; this will be felt for generations to come. Allowing books to be banned, records to be burned, or artists to be harassed and arrested for creating their own concept of art destroys a vital part of our society.

Keep the arts and all forms of expression alive and free. Vote "Yes".

Maria Pinto
The Avant Garde Society

If you knew what gets censored — you’d be surprised.

For instance, it's illegal for California political parties to announce positions on "non-partisan" elections.

This ridiculous law has never been enforced — except by City Attorney Renne, who used it as authority to censor candidate statements in the Voter Pamphlet.

The federal appeals court ruled this is an abridgement of free speech. The Supreme Court later voided that ruling on a technicality. So Renne’s censorship has been ruled unconstitutional, but the law and her policy are still on the books.

Tell the City Attorney to stop acting like the City Censor.

Vote yes.

Grassroots

Nowadays, 90% of all "obscene" materials are legal. Only "hard-core" is still denied freedom of press.

What’s the difference?

It’s supposed to be "community standards".

But laws should have objective standards.

How can record stores and museums know which music and art is illegal? As Supreme Court Justice Stewart stated in Jacobellis vs. Ohio (1964): "I know it when I see it."

Naturally, juries may be biased. "Community standards" become double standards.

Nobody should have the right to impose their biases on others.

Our community standard should be:

LIVE AND LET LIVE; READ AND LET READ.

Vote yes.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition O

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

Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: From 1980 to 1989, an experimental program in California allowed physicians to prescribe hemp (marijuana) for certain medical purposes. State law no longer allows hemp to be used for medical purposes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P would make it City policy to recommend that the State of California and the California Medical Association restore hemp medical preparations to the list of available medicines. This measure defines "hemp medical preparations" as all products made from hemp, cannabis, or marijuana that are intended for the treatment of disease, the relief of pain, or for any other healing purpose. This measure calls for physicians to be allowed to prescribe hemp for medical purposes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this declaration of policy about hemp medical preparations.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “P”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition P:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How “P” Got on the Ballot

On July 29, 1991 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition P to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399 signatures were required to place an initiative Declaration of Policy on the ballot. A random check of the signatures submitted on July 19, 1991 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,620 of the signatures submitted were valid, 2,221 more than the required number of signatures.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

When the law unnecessarily interferes with good medical practice, everyone suffers.

Medical patients who become aware that the most effective and benign agent for treating their condition is legally unavailable are forced to choose between recovery and breaking the law. According to the National Cancer Institute, one third of cancer patients receiving chemotherapy decide to discontinue potentially life-saving or life-prolonging treatments because of severe and debilitating side effects which could be greatly reduced by a medicine which is legally forbidden. Otherwise law-abiding patients who choose to obtain this medicine, or family members or friends who do this for them, are forced to break the law and pay extremely inflated prices on the black market. When all their physical and emotional resources should be devoted to recovery, they are burdened with additional stress and anxiety through fear of prosecution.

Sincere and informed physicians and other medical personnel are forced to choose between their medical oath and a cruel law which prohibits them from giving the best medical advice and treatment to their patients.

Conscientious and informed law enforcement personnel are forced to choose between human decency and compassion, or duty, which requires them to interfere in medical practices in which they are not competent to make decisions.

Particularly during the past decade, the people of San Francisco have courageously borne a terrible burden as we have watched so many of our loved ones suffer and die. Much of this suffering and death is needless and could be prevented. Your vote in favor of Proposition P will send a message to all of California and the nation that we believe medical decisions are best left to qualified physicians and their patients.

Earl Galvin
Martin Kahn

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition P
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition P

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

I am a woman born with various disabilities and have tried numerous pain medications. All have caused severe vomiting, nausea, allergies and diarrhea. I have found that smoking marijuana is the one thing that makes me feel better and helps to relieve the pain so that I can sleep. Marijuana also helps to stimulate my appetite so that I am able to eat.

Proposition P is a step toward helping me and others in similar circumstances stay alive. Please vote in favor of Prop P and help those who cannot take other medications.

Mary Gennoy

I am not a criminal, simply a person with AIDS. To relieve some life threatening symptoms I smoke marijuana. Fear grips me every time I am forced to buy on the black market — at exorbitant prices. Please help me to obtain legal marijuana. VOTE YES ON THE MEDICAL MARIJUANA INITIATIVE. It makes sense and is compassionate and necessary.

Rick Gilberg

Proposition P advises restoring hemp drugs (cannabis, marijuana) for medicinal use.

After a century of medicinal use, in 1937 hemp drugs were wrongly removed from prescription availability and remain hostage to government “reefer madness” fiction.

Hemp drugs are effective and nontoxic for treating anxiety, pain, epilepsy, muscle spasm, anorexia, AIDS wasting syndrome, depression, and glaucoma.

A recent Harvard survey of physicians found willingness to prescribe cannabis, if available. The DEA administrative law judge Francis Young ruled that cannabis should be prescribed.

The initiative to RESTORE HEMP MEDICAL PREPARATIONS TO LIST OF AVAILABLE MEDICINES IN CALIFORNIA would help let physicians once again prescribe cannabis.

Tad Mikuriya, M.D., Psychiatrist,
Former Director of Marijuana Research
National Institute of Mental Health

Don’t let narrow-minded politics interfere with good medicine. As women who have gone through chemotherapy and are surviving cancer, we ask that you vote yes on this important measure.

Jo Daly, San Francisco Police Commissioner (Retired)
Marguerite (Maggi) Rubenstein, RN, MSCC, PhD

NORML has heard from countless patients who find marijuana uniquely beneficial for nausea, AIDS wasting syndrome, spasticity, glaucoma, chronic pain, migraines, depression, epilepsy and other intractable complaints.

In 1988, Drug Enforcement Administration Judge Francis Young ruled that marijuana has clearly established medical value and should be available as a prescription drug. Nevertheless, the government won’t allow marijuana to be prescribed for medical purposes.

Please vote yes on proposition P and signal our government that it is cruel to deprive patients of medical treatment.

Dale Gieringer, California National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws
Dennis Peron, Community Activist

Prior to the outlawing of marijuana in the 1930’s, it was prescribed in this country for numerous ailments. Marijuana has recently been found especially useful in the treatment of glaucoma, cancer and AIDS.

Until 1989 Marijuana was available by prescription in California in limited cases. Since 1989 it has been unavailable under any circumstances, even to a doctor.

Our present policies of classifying marijuana as synonymous with heroin and more serious than cocaine, are not only factually incorrect but unfair. These policies deprive many seriously ill persons of the relief this relatively mild herb can bring to their suffering.

This is a humanitarian issue.

Terence Hallinan
Member Board of Supervisors

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

Marijuana has been used legally in the United States to control nausea and vomiting, and is known as a potent appetite stimulant. Physicians can prescribe morphine to control pain. They should also be allowed to prescribe marijuana to alleviate the side effects of cancer therapy, AIDS, and eye treatments.

Ivan J. Silverberg, M.D.
Ernest M. Rosenbaum, M.D.

Patients have the right to receive treatment that has been shown to be beneficial. Marijuana has been shown to be safe and effective, particularly for nausea, in people being treated for cancer, AIDS, and other serious illnesses. We support Proposition P.

David Siegel, MD, MPH
Norman Hearst, MD, MPH
Thomas J. Coates, PhD
Stephen B. Hulley, MD
Leon H. McKusick, PhD
Susan M. Kegeles, PhD
Susan M. Rubin, MPH
Mark T. Gould
Joey Taylor
Robert H. Hilliard, MA
Eve Golden, MS
Robert M. Thomas
Lee Middleton
William Wolf
Susan Folkman, PhD
Michelle Berlin, MD
William J. Woods, PhD
Jocelyn Lighthill
David R. Gibson, PhD
Larry Osborn
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies
University of California at San Francisco

People suffering from cancer or HIV should be spared pain. Our county health director informs me this policy will help alleviate suffering from chemotherapy and other difficult treatments and serious illnesses. The Republican politicians in Washington are acting to remove this treatment even when prescribed by a physician for their patients who are in desperate pain. Vote “yes” on Proposition P.

Mayor Art Agnos

Pot is good for the heart.
The NAS reports: “Indices of cardiac performance usually improve”.
The reason: pot relaxes and dilates blood vessels, opening them to more blood flow with less friction. This “substantial decrease in peripheral vascular resistance” means the heart can pump more, without increased effort.

“Cardiac output... has been found to increase by... as much as 30%”

Pot is “apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart”.

These quotes are from MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

Grassroots

Many epileptics say marijuana reduces their seizures.
Similar benefits are often reported by people with multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and various spastic disorders.
Almost all have to break the law to get their medicine.
The National Academy of Sciences concluded: “There is substantial evidence... that cannabinoids are effective in blocking... seizures, particularly cannabidiol(CBD).”

In the best-controlled human study, eight epileptics received CBD. Seven showed significant reduction in seizures; no signs of toxicity.
Yet if you supply the pot that helps a disabled friend become more able, you can go to prison.
Why?

Grassroots
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The Bush administration is trying to make patients accept "Marinol"—synthetic THC capsules—instead of real marijuana. Synthetics may be more profitable, but the natural herb is healthier.

"Marinol" is the most concentrated form of THC in history, therefore less safe.

"Marinol" contains only THC and no CBD, so it's almost useless for many purposes including seizure-prevention.

Asthma: smoking works better than capsules since it goes directly into the lungs.

Smoking takes effect in minutes; capsules can take an hour or more.

Many patients can't swallow a capsule without vomiting.

With smoking, you can tell when you've had enough; with capsules you have to guess.

The FDA approved imitation marijuana only because real marijuana was already known to be effective.

But the natural herb is more effective.

And safer.

So why can't doctors prescribe it?

Grassroots

The National Academy of Sciences concluded that pot relieves asthma attacks.

THC capsules work, but smoking pot was more effective, and works faster, since it goes directly to the lungs.

There are also special marijuana pipes which heat and vaporize the pot without burning it; you inhale fumes but no smoke.

Such pipes are especially recommended for asthma.

Yet they're illegal.

Smokeless pipes can produce bronchodilation to relieve asthma—without irritation.

Why are they illegal?

Grassroots

"ACTIVE AGAINST NAUSEA"

Some other drugs can suppress nausea, but pot actually increases appetite. (But not obesity.)

That's vital for nausea from chemotherapy or wasting syndrome due to AIDS or cancer. The NAS reports:

"...there is a need for new and more reliable anti-emetic agents.

"...There seems little doubt that THC and other cannabinoids are active against the severe nausea and vomiting produced by cancer chemotherapeutic agents.

"...Cannabis leaf, smoked or eaten, is also anti-emetic..."

Grassroots

GLAUCOMA BLINDNESS

The NAS report considered glaucoma, for which Robert Randall has been smoking ten joints/day since the 1970s—supplied by the government.

"GLAUCOMA...leading cause of blindness in the United States...characterized by an increase in intraocular pressure...300,000 new cases...each year..."

"Cannabis..., THC...and some other cannabinoid derivatives lower intraocular pressure..."

But, despite clear benefits, the FDA won't accept any more applications for government-grown pot. Even for those going blind.

Why?

Grassroots

The BNAUPI (5/2/91) reports:

"DOCTORS AT ODDS WITH DEA OVER USEFULNESS OF MARIJUANA"

"Nearly half of cancer specialists surveyed said they had recommended at least one of their patients break the law and use marijuana to counter nausea from chemotherapy", according to a Harvard survey reported in Annals of Internal Medicine 4/30/91.

But the Bush administration and DEA refuse to acknowledge reality. They've granted a few dozen patients' requests for pot. But the vast majority have to break the law to get their medicine.

Until 1970, MDs could prescribe marijuana.

(Until the 1930s, you didn't even need a prescription.)

Bring back medical freedom!

Grassroots

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

The National Academy of Sciences 1982 book, MARIJUANA AND HEALTH, makes clear that pot is less harmful than most other drugs (including alcohol and nicotine).

They concluded that pot has "very low lethal toxicity" and "no instance of human lung carcinoma attributable solely to marijuana smoking has yet been reported."

They found pot is "apparently without deleterious effect on the normal heart and circulation" and "produced no evidence of brain atrophy" and "neither marijuana nor THC causes chromosome breaks."

Very few drugs could pass such exacting scrutiny! Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

I: The 12-9-87 Chronicle reports:

"3 S.F. HOSPITALS OK MARIJUANA, DOCTOR SAYS"

"At least three San Francisco hospitals routinely permit cancer patients to smoke marijuana because it relieves the violent nausea associated with chemotherapy, a doctor who practices in the city said yesterday."

"To be honest, I do not even think of marijuana as being illegal," said Dr. Ivan Silverberg, M.D., a doctor of oncology at UCSF."

"Dr. Ernest Rosenbaum, associate chief of medicine at Mt. Zion, said, 'We are not against it, because marijuana makes most cancer patients feel more comfortable when they come in for chemotherapy. So we tactfully encourage it.'"

Take politics out of the doctors office —

Vote yes on Prop P

Grassroots

A National Academy of Sciences committee found pot valuable for its "effect on appetite, nausea and vomiting, epilepsy, muscle spasticity, anxiety, depression, pain, and on glaucoma, asthma, and the symptoms of withdrawal from alcohol and narcotics."

"What is perhaps more encouraging than the therapeutic effects observed thus far is that cannabis seems to exert its beneficial effects through mechanisms that differ from those of other available drugs."

"This raises the possibility that some patients who would not be helped by conventional therapies could be treated effectively with cannabis."

Even when "conventional therapies" work, they're usually much more toxic than pot. If marijuana is apparently the safest and most effective medicine for some patients, their physicians should have the legal right to prescribe it. Vote Yes.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition P
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RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE
HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE OF CALI-
FORNIA.

I. The people of the City and County of San
Francisco recommend that the State of California
and the California Medical Association restore
hemp medical preparations to the list of available
medicines in California. Licensed physicians
shall not be penalized for or restricted from pre-
scribing hemp preparations for medical purposes
to any patient.

(1) Definition:
The term "hemp medical preparations" means
all products made from hemp, cannabis, or mari-
juana, in all forms, that are designed, intended,
or used for human consumption, for the treatment
of any disease, the relief of pain, or for any
healing purpose, including the relief of asthma,
glaucoma, arthritis, anorexia, migraine, multiple
sclerosis, epilepsy, nausea, stress, for use as an
antibiotic, an anti-emetic, or as any healing agent,
or as an adjunct to any medical procedure for the
treatment of cancer, HIV infection, or any other
medical procedure or herbal treatment.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158
in City Hall starting Tuesday, October 7 through Tuesday,
November 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.,
Monday through Friday and 7 a.m. – 8 p.m. Election Day.
Take advantage of this option if you will not be able
to go to your polling place on Election Day.
Out of town on November 5, 1991? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333
PROPOSITION Q
Shall it be the policy of the People of San Francisco for the federal government to reduce the military budget by 10% each year for the next 5 years and use the savings to better provide certain specified health and social welfare services and programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the federal government decides how much of the federal budget to spend on various programs, including the military.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition Q is a declaration of policy that calls on the federal government to reduce military spending by 10% each year for the next 5 years. The measure calls for the savings to be used for better housing, education, health care, AIDS and cancer research, job training and employment opportunities, environmental protection, mass transit, drug abuse prevention and treatment, and deficit reduction.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt this declaration of policy about federal spending.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “Q”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition Q:

If the proposed Declaration of Policy is approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government.

How “Q” Got on the Ballot
On July 25, 1991 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Doris M. Ward, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto, Roberta Achtenberg, Terence Hallinan, Willie B. Kennedy, Carole Migden, Kevin F. Shelley and Jim Gonzalez. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Federal Budget Priorities

PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q is your chance to send a powerful message to our nation's leaders: "It's time to bring our tax dollars home!"

During the past 12 years while military spending has doubled, federal support for San Francisco has decreased by 33%. That means less of our federal tax dollar is available to help our city with the urgent problems of homelessness, education, AIDS, mass transit, and other human and environmental needs.

Proposition Q says we want more of our tax dollars used to help solve the crisis in our schools and on our streets. It's time to reverse the military spending frenzy of the 1980's. It's time to invest in our communities.

Military experts agree that we can cut military spending without weakening our defense. We don't need to spend billions on Stealth Bombers, MX Missiles, Star Wars, and the testing of new nuclear bombs.

Excessive military spending hurts our economy by adding to our national deficit and keeping interest rates high. Military spending creates far fewer jobs than spending on construction, civilian industries, education and health care.

Proposition Q is part of a national referendum that the voters of Chicago have already passed by a 74% majority. It will appear on local ballots across the nation in 1992. Let's make San Francisco the second major city to stand up for sanity in how our tax dollars are spent.

We cannot afford to remain silent while our precious resources are wasted on weapons we don't need for our defense. The health of our cities is vital to our national security.

As your local elected representatives, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition Q.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 19, 1991.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Kennedy, Shelley and Ward.

Noes: Supervisor Maher

Absent: Supervisors Hsieh and Migden.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

We strongly support additional Federal help for San Francisco to fight AIDS and homelessness and to improve our educational and mass transit systems.

Passage of Proposition Q would injure all four of these causes.

We would like to believe that the folks in Washington might grant some of the so-called "saved" funds from the proposed Proposition Q budget cuts — and our already lost San Francisco Presidio payroll money — for our City's other needs:

• Unfortunately, San Francisco will never receive "dime one" of these alleged "savings".

• The closing of Letterman Military Hospital didn't help its AIDS patients.

• Let's not talk about what the Letterman closing did to the homeless veterans suffering from post-traumatic war stress.

Strong majorities in the National Democratic and Republican Parties — over 80% in the U.S. House of Representatives — support current military budgeting levels as vital to United States safety and World Peace.

No doubt, some Exxon Oil executives would have liked Proposition Q-type budget cutbacks in place against all those "difficult" Coast Guardsmen overseeing the 1989 Valdez, Alaska tanker-spill cleanup operations.

Proposition Q will indeed send "a powerful message to our nation's leaders":

• To halt needed funds for San Francisco's AIDS patients and needy veterans . . .

• To put the Bay Area on the bottom of their flood control and water protection funding lists . . .

• To cutback on Presidio historical buildings preservation money . . .

• To lower Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers' resources for San Francisco Bay protection.

Vote AGAINST Proposition Q!!!

Citizens for Responsible Spending

Alexa Smith

Terence Faulkner

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

Proposition Q urges a 10% per year military budget cutback. A major problem with Proposition Q is that it doesn’t define which military programs should be cut:

The U.S. Army, its reserves, and the California National Guard proved to be indispensable in the emergency following the October 17, 1989 Earthquake.

The needs caused by natural disasters — often caused by earth, wind, and fire — cannot be regulated by such 10% statutory reductions.

Oil spills, ship collisions, and rampant drug smuggling are problems which will occupy the Coast Guard for many decades to come. Ship safety inspections and enforcement of maritime regulations are further Coast Guard duties that will not go away.

The hydra-headed nightmares created by toxic wastes will long pose grave burdens for the military. The cleanups of the 1991 Sacramento River’s 45 miles of pesticide pollution and the 1989 Valdez, Alaska oil tanker mess are cases in point.

Maintaining the promised quality of medical services to veterans and their families is a continuing ethical obligation of the United States government. We certainly don’t need to close down more facilities like Letterman Military Hospital!!

Taking money away from the Army Corps of Engineers would be a quick way to sabotage flood prevention programs and the water quality of the San Francisco Bay and Delta.

Proposition Q’s budget cutbacks, if implemented, would impact directly — and adversely — on the Bay region’s economy, public health, citizen safety, and environmental quality.

Unwise military cutbacks have already forced the planned closing down of the San Francisco Presidio as an Army base. Further military funds will still be needed to preserve the Presidio’s historical buildings for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Citizens for Responsible Spending

Alexa Smith

Terence Faulkner

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Reduced military spending benefits us all. A U.S. Conference of Mayors study found that a 10% shift from military to urban programs would result in a U.S. personal disposable income rise of $2.2 billion annually and greatly improved state and local tax revenues. Non-military spending creates more jobs. If Proposition Q’s spending changes were implemented there would be a net annual increase of 477,000 jobs nationwide. Military programs also pollute. The Defense Department has created 14,401 toxic waste sites. The federal toxic cleanup budget is dwarfed by the Pentagon budget.

The opponents of Proposition Q must be pulling our leg. They must know that the services they mention, such as the Coast Guard and disaster relief, can be fully funded by a fraction of the bloated military budget we have today. Congress can easily make the cuts that Proposition Q calls for through elimination of unnecessary and wasteful military programs. Simply cutting “Black Budget” programs, such as post-nuclear war planning, would save the first year’s cuts. The Stealth Program alone will cost U.S. taxpayers $5 billion dollars if the Pentagon gets all the planes it has asked for.

It is only by shifting our spending priorities from military waste to education, health, unemployment training, transit, environmental cleanup and peaceful technology that we will improve the quality of life in our nation’s cities.

Submitted by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 26, 1991.


Absent: Supervisors Brit and Hsieh.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

For the future of our city and our nation, join us in voting yes on Proposition Q.

Assemblyman John Burton
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
Alex Forman, SANE/FREEZE
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
National Lawyers Guild Bay Area Chapter
I.L.W.U. Local 6
Buck Bagot, Member Bernal Hts Democratic Club*
Women's Intl League for Peace and Freedom
Neighbor to Neighbor
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Green Party of San Francisco
S.F. Gray Panthers
Cesar Avcarruns
San Francisco Tomorrow
Greater Mission Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth*
Maryann O'Sullivan, Exec. Dir. Health Access*
John Moran, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*

Physicians for Social Responsibility
American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Region
Religious Soc of Friends, Soc Concerns Committee
Bishop Melvin Talbert, United Methodist Church*
San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
Latino Issues Forum
United Educators of San Francisco
Roberto Hernandez, Mission Econ & Cult Assoc*
Abalone Alliance
San Francisco Urban League
Enola Maxwell, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
George Wesolek, Justice & Peace Commission, Catholic Archdiocese*
Veterans Peace Action
Dr. Amos Brown, Minister 3rd Baptist Church
Eva & Gene Royale - Chicano Latino Caucus*
Lulann S. McGriff, Pres. NAACP Branch*
David Catfield, Reg. Dir. Greenpeace Action*
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Marie C. Malliett, Pres. C.W.A., Local 9410*
Charlene Tschichart, St. Anthony's Foundation*
David Hartshough

*For Identification Purposes Only

Bush spent $1 billion a day to kill hundreds of thousands of Iraqis in a war that benefited only big banks and oil monopolies. Bush's invasion of Panama was another case of taxpayers financing a war of aggression against a Third World country. Bush's "New World Order" is really the same old imperialism. We need money for jobs and human needs, not war! U.S. hands off Cuba and Korea!

Gloria Estela La Riva,
Candidate for Mayor

Reagan presided over the greatest military build-up outside of war. The transfer of wealth from taxpayer to defense industries continues. Our enemy isn't some boogie man in the Middle East; our enemies are poverty, ignorance, and disease at home. Let Congress know you want America to be number one in quality of life, not arms sales. Vote "yes" on Q.

Green Party of California, San Francisco Local
Kim Gilgenberg, Coordinating Committee

The Cold War is over but the Pentagon keeps spending our money at record levels. This year the taxpayers of San Francisco sent $1.4 billion to the Pentagon - almost 50% more than in 1980. Yet federal support for our city for transit is down 54%, housing is down 61% and job training is down 86%. Homelessness, underfunded schools, the AIDS epidemic and inadequate medical care are not simply local problems. They should also be national priorities. Proposition Q is our chance to bring our tax dollars home. We need more money for schools and housing - not the MX Missile and new Stealth bombers. Proposition Q is part of a national referendum on the future of our nation and our city. Join the elected leaders of San Francisco who support Proposition Q. Vote yes on Proposition Q. Our future depends on it.

Alex Forman
SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security.

In 1981, the federal government spent $36 billion on housing. This year they will spend $7 billion. That's why people don't have homes, and a record number are homeless in every major American city. Vote "yes" on Proposition Q.

Mayor Art Agnos
Federal Budget Priorities

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Proposition Q notifies the United States Congress that the City and County of San Francisco has developed, in addition to a notorious foreign policy, a domestic agenda. In fact, the City now wants to control the federal budget!

Vote "NO" on Proposition Q

Why can't the members of the Board of Supervisors focus their attention on the needs of residents of the City and County of San Francisco? Why can't the Board of Supervisors leave the federal budget to the United States Congress?

The Board and the Mayor can't resolve San Francisco's own budgetary problems but that doesn't stop them from meddling with the federal budget! Sure, we want more money for housing, education, health care, job training and all the other necessities of our residents but let's focus our energies and talents on what can be realistically accomplished in San Francisco. Let's stop making our City look foolish!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION Q

"It is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that the federal government should reduce the military budget by ten percent (10%) each year for the next five (5) years, and use the savings to provide better housing, education, health care, AIDS and cancer research, job training and employment opportunities, environmental protection, mass transit, drug abuse prevention and treatment, and deficit reduction."
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!

NO DEJE QUE EL VIENTO SE LLEVE SUS PAPELES RECICLABLES!

Ponga sus papeles reciclables en bolsas de papel o amárrelos con cuerda.
Ayúdenos a mantener limpias nuestras calles mientras recicles!
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OOPS!

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

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

October 22, 23, or 24

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

There continues to be considerable confusion about the rules and procedures governing absentee ballots. The results are that some voters do not vote and others send in ballots that are not counted because the proper procedures were not followed. Voters who wish to vote by absentee ballot should familiarize themselves with the following information:

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night time telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, you may have your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the absentee ballot return envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, or because of a physical handicap are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot be delivered to you by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. These ballots may not be mailed.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

Because of the large volume of telephone calls we receive prior to the election, we have revised our telephone system to improve our responses to your telephone calls.

When you call the Office of the Registrar of Voters at 554-4375, you will hear a recording offering you the following choices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOUCH-TONE PHONES</th>
<th>Press 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH-SPEAKERS</td>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE-SPEAKERS</td>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTARY PHONES</td>
<td>Hold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For people with touch-tone phones, after you have Pressed 1, you will have the following options:

- Voter Registration Information and Forms: Press 1
- Absentee Voting Information and Forms: Press 2
- Working at the Polls Information: Press 3
- Candidates and Ballot Measures: Press 4
- Information about Registered Voters: Press 5
- REPEAT — (Listen to choices again): Press 9
- Other Topics: Hold

Please write if you have suggestions for improving our telephone system.

-----------------------------

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

-----------------------------

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Voter's Quick Reference Card.
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**VOTER'S QUICK-REFERENCE CARD** To save time and reduce lines, take this coupon with you to the Polls. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to "YES" or "NO" for each of the Local Propositions.

**PLEASE** - Write the location of your Polling Place here->

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return Address

Germaine O Wong
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ROOM 158 - CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA  94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

PRECINCTS
APPLICABLE:
8400's, 9400's, 9700's

Ballot Type
11
91
3

19th Assembly District

Voter, the location of your polling place is shown on the label below. Please DO NOT remove the label from the Absentee Ballot Application.

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - November 5, 1991 Municipal Election

SIGN this application and return it to the Registrar of Voters no later than October 29, 1991.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City  State  Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote. My new address is printed below. (Do NOT use a P.O. Box or mail drop.)

Number and Street Name

City  Apt. No.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for Nov. 5, 1991; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot if there is a Run-Off Election on Dec. 10, 1991.

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.

☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Info Pamphlet in: Spanish  Chinese

Your SIGNATURE - Do Not Print  Date Signed  Day Time Phone  Evening Phone